The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXVIII OCTOBER, 1942 No. 3

DIPLOMATIC ACTIVITIES OF THE ENGLISH DOMINICANS IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

FROM its inception the Order of Preachers set itself the task of working for the salvation of souls chiefly through the agency of preaching.[1] Consequently anything that impeded the salvation of souls or preaching was rigorously eschewed, while study which favored their attainment was given a privileged place in the life of the Friar Preacher and in the legislation of the Order. Study and preaching were the chief ways by which a Friar Preacher worked for the salvation of men; they were placed at the very foundation of the Dominican system.

Nevertheless the fundamental law of the Order allowed ample scope for the development and exercise of other talents and abilities. If the diplomatic ability, the prudent sagacity, the administrative efficiency, or the personal charm of a friar could be turned to the good of souls, the Constitutions left open the possibility of its exercise by granting to superiors the power of dispensing from various observances of the Order.[2] Hence we find Dominicans eventually doing a variety of work that at first seems to be connected only remotely with their vocation as preachers. Matthew Paris, the Benedictine chronicler, did not understand the spirit of the Dominican Constitutions and observing these multifold activi-

[1] *Constitutiones antiquae ordinis fratrum predicatorum*, ed. H. Denifle, *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, I (1885), 194.

[2] *Loc. cit.*

ties remarked, almost with a sneer: "The whole earth was their cell and the ocean was their cloister."[3] But as Father Bede Jarrett writes: "They took as their boast what he used to say of them with scorn."[4]

The English Dominicans took a prominent part in the life of their country. Besides their chosen work as preachers and at the universities, they executed the mandates of popes and legates, assisted the bishops, were themselves sometimes made bishops, collected the tithes from the crusades, reformed monasteries, and carried out many similar commissions. They also served their king and country as loyal Englishmen. Indeed, the volume of business done for the crown appears to have greatly exceeded that carried out at the behests of the papacy. The Dominicans served the King as confessors, messengers, ambassadors, judges, or councillors. Even when most zealously preaching the various Crusades, they were working indirectly for the King, since almost two-thirds of the money collected in England for the crusade came eventually, through some channel or another, into the royal purse. The greater part of our evidence, and the most interesting, is from the reign of Edward I. King Henry III made extensive use of the Dominicans, but, with the exception of John of Darlington, none of them took such prominent parts in national affairs as we find being played by William of Southampton and William Hothum in the succeeding reign. Henry III chose Darlington as royal confessor; Walter Winterbourne and Luke of Woodford were the confessors of Edward. The office is more significant than at first appears, because the royal confessor was expected to give advice and counsel on many topics, and sometimes to act as messenger or legate.[5]

I. *Dominicans in the Service of Henry III*

It is evident that King Henry frequently had Dominicans in his company, for in a letter to Robert Kilwardby, Provincial in 1256, he alludes to those friars whose presence and familiarity he had

[3] *Chronica Majora* (Rolls Series), V, 529.

[4] *The English Dominicans* (London, 1921), p. 15.

[5] Cf. Jarrett, *op. cit.*, chap. VI, "Royal Confessors."

enjoyed at various times.[6] By 1239, when Matthew Paris notes that the Dominican John of St. Giles had become a member of the royal council, the Friars Preachers had served the King frequently enough for him to add: "The Preachers and Minorites had at this time become the Counsellors and special messengers of Kings; . . ."[7] The first record of anything of this kind is from May 7, 1234 when Walter, Prior of Bristol, was empowered to receive, in the presence of the Bishop of Llandaff and the Abbots of Tintern and Neath, the oath of Hubert de Burgh, probably in connection with Hubert's reconciliation with the King, which had taken place on April 26. The Prior was ordered to make a record of the proceedings, certified by himself and the other witnesses, and come with all haste to the King, who desired his counsel touching the further prosecution of the matter.[8] In 1247 Matthew, Dominican Provincial, and Adam Marsh, O.F.M., were sent over seas on an embassy.[9] Again, in July, 1255, King Henry sent Gilbert of Battle and Roger of Refham to Sweden to negotiate.[10] In December of the same year, after the King's return from Scotland, where he had established a new regency and had punished the barons who were anxious to dissolve Scottish connections with England, the Prior of Lynn and another Dominican went to the northern Kingdom on royal business. The King had requested that Roger of Chester should travel with the Prior as companion, but when Roger proved too ill for the journey another friar was substituted.[11]

During this same period Robert Bacon, the learned Oxford Dominican, was frequently employed by the Crown. He was present at court during the time of the Earl Marshall troubles in 1233 and

[6] P. R. O., *Ancient Correspondence, Special Collection,* 1/2/77.

[7] *Chron. Maj.*, III, 627.

[8] *Close Rolls 1231-1234*, p. 419. Prior Walter was evidently a man of some prominence in his section of the country, as the following year we find Gilbert Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, on the occasion of giving certain manors to his sister Eleanor, pledging his word in the hands of the Prior of Bristol, in the presence of noble witnesses. *Cal. Pat. R. 1232-1247*, pp. 125-6.

[9] *Cal. Lib. R. 1245-1251*, p. 132.

[10] *Cal. Pat. R. 1247-1258*, p. 419. *Close Rolls 1254-1256*, p. 210.

[11] *Close Rolls 1254-1256*, p. 383.

took a definite stand for peace in a sermon preached before the King.[12] In 1234 he and Robert Grosseteste, under orders from the court, handled a delicate piece of business at Oxford, and in the following year he was given custody of the lands and heirs of Warin Doynel.[13]

There is no way of gauging the political activities of John of St. Giles, but from the time he returned from Germany in the autumn of 1235[14] he was called on many times to give advice or execute commissions. In 1237 good horses were provided for him by the sheriff of Cambridgeshire so that he might go to the King at York. The next year he was executor of the will of Joan, the King's sister. In 1239 he became one of the royal councillors.[15] Again, in 1242, he served as papal delegate with the Bishop of London and Adam Marsh in hearing a case between the Bishop of St. David's and the King.[16]

In 1254 William Fresney, who later became Archbishop of Edessa, went to Rome to petition for a commutation of King Henry's crusading vow in favor of an expedition against the Saracens of North Africa.[17] The mission, however, was unsuccessful. In 1266 Fresney was sent by the King and Papal Legate to the Castle of Kenilworth to treat with the rebels, but fearing their commander, Hastings, Earl of Derby, he lodged with the Augustinian canons of the town. The garrison had heard of his coming, and, thinking that Ottoboni had sent him to level an excommunication against them, sent messengers warning him to return to the royal camp.[18]

In 1258 Henry sent Gilbert Talebot to the Dominicans, Templars, and many other religious Orders commanding them, if they prized

[12] *Chron. Maj.*, III, 244.

[13] *Close Rolls, 1231-1234*, p. 568. *Ibid., 1234-1237*, p. 145.

[14] *Chron. Maj.*, III, 324.

[15] *Cal. Lib. R. 1226-1240*, pp. 291, 318. *Cal. Pat. R. 1232-1247*, p. 214. *Chron. Maj.*, III, 627.

[16] *Monumenta Franciscana* (Rolls Series), I, 342.

[17] *Foedera*, I, 308, 316. For Fresney's career see, W. Gumbley, O.P., "William Fresney, O.P., Archbishop of Rages (Edessa), 1263-1290," *Flintshire Historical Society Journal* (1914-1915), pp. 36-41.

[18] Thomas Walsingham, *Ypodigma Neustriae* (R.S.), pp. 552-53.

their lands and holdings within his realm, to lend ear and faithfully execute what Gilbert would impart on his behalf.[19] This information comes from a letter of credence which contains no suggestion as to the weighty duty enjoined upon the religious, but it was the troubled summer of the Oxford Provisions, and probably the King was endeavoring to enlist as many supporters as he could, even under threat, if necessary.

All these disconnected incidents must have had an effect, though mainly indirect, on English life. The one Dominican, during Henry III's reign, who was longest in a position to exercise a direct influence on national events was John of Darlington. From the year 1256 he was almost constantly at the King's side, and his position as royal confessor gave him an advantage possessed by few others. But the scanty information concerning his activities during this period thwarts any attempt to point definitely to one fact or one sphere in which his influence was felt. This attempt is rendered all the more futile by the troubled events that took place during his tenure with the King. The intricacies, the shifting loyalties, the many-sided enmities consequent on the events of 1258 even defeat attempts to deal with men like De Montfort and the Earl of Gloucester. The circumstances of Darlington's call to the service of the King, his capacity as confessor, and the testimony of Henry himself indicate that his influence should be sought primarily in the personal life of the King, and only secondarily in political events. If Darlington succeeded in strengthening Henry's character by making it more firm and constant, then only does it seem permissible to claim that indirectly events were shaped and moulded by him.[20]

When Darlington was made a royal councillor in 1256, he was well fitted for his task. He was mature and distinguished for his learning. He came to the King at the beginning of a period when sound and impartial advice were a sore necessity, " for the king

[19] *Close Rolls, 1256-1259*, pp. 317-18.

[20] Darlington was undoubtedly consulted, and perhaps advised the course of the King in seeking dispensation from his oath to uphold the Provisions of Oxford.

now had need of prudent counsel and of spiritual comfort; for on being certified [1256] of the ruin of the Pope and his army, whereby the kingdom was exposed to danger, he was in a state of great mental consternation."[21] As affairs proceeded leading up to the crisis of 1258, the anxiety of the King must have deepened. Darlington was a firm support throughout this period; he served as one of the twelve royal representatives on the committee of reform appointed in April, 1258, which drew up the Provisions of Oxford;[22] and he was a member of the committee set up on July 4, 1263 to treat with the barons concerning the Provisions, and witnessed the agreement, made later in the same year, to submit the whole question to King Louis IX of France.[23] But in 1261 he had been elected prior of the London house—probably an attempt on the part of the Order to reclaim him—and could not give his undivided attention to royal affairs. Consequently in September, 1265, about a month after the battle of Evesham, King Henry wrote an urgent letter to Provincial Robert Kilwardby requesting Darlington's immediate return to court "to render assistance to the King as he was formerly accustomed to do." During his stay at court, the King asserts, he had rendered himself amiable to all, had endeared himself to royalty and nobility alike, and had proved himself a man of great wisdom, prudence, and foresight in affairs of state. He had been the King's principal instructor in sound doctrine, and had shown himself a faithful friend to his sovereign in times of distress and tribulation. Darlington's presence at court, Henry adds, was so necessary at the present juncture, both for himself and the realm, that he neither ought nor could be permitted to remain absent.[24]

In this letter Darlington's services to his sovereign personally occupy a prominent place, but he had been consulted on affairs of

[21] M. Paris, *Chron. Maj.*, V, 549.

[22] W. Stubbs, *Selected Charters* (9th ed. revised, 1921, H. W. C. Davis), p. 379. *Annales Monastici* (*Burton*) (Rolls Series), I, 446-53.

[23] For a detailed account of these activities see MacInerny, *History of the Irish Dominicans* (Dublin, 1916), pp. 306-20; and *D. N. B.*, V, 511-12.

[24] P. R. O., *Ancient Correspondence*, S. C., 1/2/77, edited by MacInerny, *op. cit.*, pp. 319-20.

state and his judgment had been found reliable. In the confusion and attempts at settlement following the battle of Evesham, he was a man to have at hand. He was conversant with the whole course of events leading up to the battle and, moreover, was an amiable character on good terms with all. Probably his chief merit in a time of frequent defections, of quickly changing enmities and loyalties, was his constancy. He had been faithful in times of distress and tribulation and now could be counted upon to remain true and loyal.

An interesting side light to the troubled events of these years in which Darlington was so closely concerned might be suggested. In 1259 and early 1260 the Lord Edward's real or apparent co-operation with Simon De Montfort caused his father to suspect that the two were conspiring to dethrone him. In February, Edward sent Darlington to him in France, where he was at the time confirming the treaty with Louis IX, to allay his fears. Unfortunately we do not have the message of Edward, but the reply of the King, sent by the hand of Darlington on the first of March, seems to indicate that Edward, while apparently working with De Montfort, had really found a way to turn this friendship to the good of the royal cause:

> What you enjoined on him he expounded to us discreetly and prudently, and we heard him on those points benignly and attentively, and were greatly heartened and rejoiced at hearing them; and because of them we shall soon send one of our trusted men to England to see if words are borne out by deeds.[25]

If the suggested interpretation of Darlington's mission and this letter is incorrect, another interpretation may be that Darlington effected the reconciliation of father and son. At all events, from thenceforward the King and Edward were in close co-operation, and a public reconciliation took place two months later on.

During Edward's reign Darlington retained the confidence of the Crown but was occupied mainly as collector of the crusading tithes. In 1272 he witnessed the formal protest registered on behalf of the

[25] *Close Rolls, 1259-1261*, pp. 276-77.

King to the provision of Kilwardby to Canterbury.[26] Six years later he was sent to Rome as a member of a legation concerning the annual tribute of 1,000 marks due to the Pope for the kingdoms of England and Ireland and to negotiate a further loan of crusading funds.[27] A friendly letter from Darlington to John Kirkby, king's clerk, in mid-August, 1279, requested him to persuade the King to attend his consecration as archbishop of Dublin. This testifies to the friendship that existed between Darlington and King Edward.[28]

The question of alleged Dominican royalist sympathies should be examined at this point before proceeding to the consideration of their diplomatic activity during the reign of Edward I, since the allegation is based chiefly on John of Darlington's association with Henry III, the meeting of Parliament at Oxford Blackfriars in 1258, and the residence of Edward and his suite at the same priory before the battle of Lewes in 1263.[29] Attention is also called to the share of the Dominicans in the Piers Gaveston affair, the slain favorite of Edward II, and their persevering loyalty to that monarch after his deposition. Though we are only interested in the question in as much as it affects the Dominicans of the thirteenth century, it may be briefly said that their celebration of the prolonged obsequies of Gaveston at Oxford and their final burial of his remains at their new priory of King's Langley can hardly be adduced as a profound argument of their thorough-going royalist sympathies.[30] Their championing of Edward II cannot be consid-

[26] *Cal. Close R., 1272-1279*, p. 39.

[27] MacInerny, *Irish Dominicans*, pp. 339-44, cites *in extenso* the pertinent documents. His criticism of Darlington's participation in this embassy, though qualified, is scarcely justified. It was not Darlington's place to judge the motives of Edward, even if he foresaw that the King's crusading promises would not be fulfilled.

[28] *Brevia Regis*, 7 Edw. I, cited from MacInerny, *op. cit.*, p. 357, where the text is printed in full; to be found also in Prynne, *Records*, p. 227.

[29] A. G. Little, *The Greyfriars at Oxford* (Oxford Historical Society, 1891), p. 72, text and n. 4.

[30] Cf. Jarrett, *English Dominicans*, pp. 5-8, concerning the Dominicans and Piers Gaveston.

ered as reprehensible; after all, Edward had been foully treated and they were on the side of the injured.

The statement that the Friars Preachers were royalist conveys a hidden compliment. It is a tribute to their highly intellectual training: they were men who could do the work that was demanded, they were able, and moreover, loyal. The attribution, however, usually brings with it an odium that arises by contrasting the action of the Dominicans with the Franciscans, who are always set down, not always with adequate reason, as the champions of the poor and, in the case of the baronial wars, of the barons and De Montfort.[31] It is interesting to quote a recent author to show the line of argument. After mentioning the parliament held at the Oxford Blackfriars in 1258 the writer proceeds:

> John de Darlington, Friar Preacher and King's Confessor, was one of the twelve king's commissioners chosen to draw up, in conjunction with twelve baronial representatives, the Provisions of Oxford. Thus the Black Friars entered the lists as King's champions, while their rivals, the Franciscans, were warm supporters of the baronial cause. Their royalist sympathies were again shown at the time of Edward II's deposition, when they became implicated in the movement for the king's rescue.[32]

It is difficult to understand how Dominican faithfulness to their royal masters should carry with it the suspicion that they were on the side of royal misrule, and consequently cared nothing for and neglected the state of the common people. They were royal confessors, but then kings also have souls to be saved. They were royal advisers, but again, good advice and counsel are potent means of bringing about reform. Even though it is probably true that some Dominicans favored royal policy, since the Order has never trampled on the freedom of the individual in such questions, it is not fair to judge the sentiments of one or two thousand men by the loyalties of some of their number. If Darlington aided the King,

[31] De Montfort alone seems to have been working for real reform and the popular cause. The baronial movement as a whole appears to be feudal in character, meant primarily to benefit the baronial class.

[32] B. Formoy, *The Dominican Order in England before the Reformation* (London, 1925), p. 78.

while Adam Marsh, the Franciscan, sympathized with and counselled De Montfort, this is insufficient reason to draw a general conclusion. In regard to the parliament of 1258 the only thing the use of Oxford Blackfriars really proves is that the Oxford priory possessed a large hall that could be utilized for deliberation. In fact the use of Blackfriars may be an argument in favor of baronial sympathy on the part of the Oxford Dominicans. The barons had things pretty much their own way by this time and perhaps they went to Blackfriars because they knew they would be free from royal meddling. The fact that Edward stayed in the same convent proves nothing as to the political views of the Dominicans. They could hardly turn away a royal guest under any circumstances.

The arguments thus alleged as proof of Dominican royalist tendencies are not convincing. Indeed, there is little evidence either way to show how the sympathies of the majority of both Franciscans and Dominicans went during the whole crisis. Both Orders received royal benefactions, both served the King as ambassadors and messengers, friars of both Orders were intimate with Grosseteste, both Orders received benefactions from De Montfort.

Nevertheless there are several facts which make it clear that the Dominicans too were on the side of reform. We have pointed out elsewhere the part taken by Robert Bacon and other Dominicans in connection with the Earl Marshall troubles in 1233. Bacon worked hand in hand with the bishops the whole time, yet could on occasion serve the King. John of St. Giles, it is true, became a royal councillor in 1239, but his advice and assistance were equally coveted by Bishop Robert Grosseteste, who was so frequently in opposition to certain points of the King's policy, a testimony to the impartiality and fairmindedness of the friar. Even Darlington, while he was serving the King, used his position of vantage to gain the pardon of numerous common people and of baronial sympathizers.[33] Finally, it is well to remember that Dominicans as well as Franciscans formed an intimate part of life at Oxford where the problems and passing scandals of Henry's reign were discussed with vigor and intelligence, and where royal attempts at bureaucracy and royal foreign interests met with little sympathy.

[33] MacInerny, *op. cit.*, pp. 309, 314, 318, 320-22, 324, 326-329.

II. *Friars Preachers in the Service of Edward I*

During the reign of Edward the Dominicans were increasingly employed in the execution of royal affairs. Their participation in the business of the crusade carried over into the new reign, as did the services of Darlington, who may have been confirmed in his office of Royal Confessor at Edward's accession.[34] A larger number of Dominicans came into prominence under Edward probably because foreign affairs occupied the position of importance that had been claimed by domestic troubles in the time of his father.[35] We have record of a large number of isolated missions carried out by various friars. In May, 1275, at the King's appointment, Oliver d'Eyncourt, Prior of Oxford, and John Pecham decided a suit in the University which had long been pending in the Chancellor's court.[36] Early in 1277 friars Andrew Pentecost and John Savenak were sent over-seas on king's business.[37] In 1297 John Wrotham and William Pickering were sent by the King to Damme, and, in the same year, Gregory of Wales and his companion went with forty soldiers from Wales to Winchelsea in order to cross with the King to Flanders.[38] A mission to Guienne undertaken in 1289 by Walter Winterbourne, now the Royal Confessor,[39] and Robert Chelmsford is interesting as an indication of the amount of time required and some of the hazards to be met on a journey of this kind. At the King's request they visited his page, Alban, who was lying ill at Blakeney. To meet the expenses incurred during this visit and

[34] Cf. MacInerny, *Irish Dominicans*, p. 330.

[35] Dominicans, at this time, were acting as royal messengers all over Europe. Thus the Duke of Sweden sent two Dominicans, Bert and Commerus, to negotiate with Henry III. In 1264 Miles of Stratheam and Simon de la Fountayne were sent to Henry by the Scottish King (*Cal. Pat., 1258-1266*, p. 387). In 1301 the royal ambassadors from Cyprus to England were Dominicans; as also from Aragon in 1342; from Gascony in 1338; Brittany in 1362; Flanders in 1373; Brabant in 1303. Jarrett, *English Dominicans*, p. 112.

[36] *Cal. Close R., 1272-1279*, p. 232.

[37] *Cal. Pat. R., 1272-1281*, p. 197.

[38] British Museum, *Additional Ms. 7965*, fols. 24^{v}, 10.

[39] P. R. O., *Rot. Elemos. Regist.*, 17-18 Edw. I, m. 3.

to pay for a pair of boots each, they received ten shillings on March 25. In June they were allowed eight shillings, eight pence, for necessary expenses and for the tailor's work on their summer garments. In August, on their return to England, Robert of Chelmsford met with a severe injury and had to be brought by cart from Dover to Canterbury.[40] Thus these two friars were occupied about six months, from March to August, on a journey to and from the Continent. Of course they were delayed by their visit to the King's page and by the accident suffered by one of them on the return journey, but the case gives some idea of the duration of absence from ordinary duties required by such missions.

The most interesting part of the record of Dominican negotiations in this century concerns their activity during the troubles between Edward I and Llewelyn of Wales; in the settlement of the Scottish succession in 1291-92; and in the negotiation of peace with France later in the same decade.[41]

During the Welsh campaigns the Dominicans of the Rhuddlan priory played an active part. In 1277 they took charge of some of the sick of the English army, and two of the friars became bearers of communications to London.[42] After the renewal of hostilities between the English and Welsh in March, 1282, the Friars Preachers continued to minister to the English army in spite of the fact that Anian, Dominican Bishop of St. Asaph, had excommunicated the English soldiery because they had burned down his cathedral.[43] In 1283, after the cessation of hostilities, Nicholas of Redmersle,

[40] *Ibid.*, m. 4. Jarrett, *English Dominicans*, pp. 114-18, gives an interesting account of the travels and expenses of the royal confessors.

[41] Cf. Jarrett, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-13, for a short account of the diplomatic activities of the English Dominicans after the thirteenth century. The unpublished dissertation of R. D. Clarke, *Some Secular Activities of the English Dominicans during the Reigns of Edward I, Edward II and Edward III*, may also be consulted on this point. Available at the Institute of Historical Research, London. See *Summary* in the *Bulletin of Historical Research*, X (1932-1933).

[42] R. C. Easterling, "The Friars in Wales," in *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 1914, p. 334.

[43] *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland* (ed. A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs), I, 536-7.

Prior of Rhuddlan, together with the Franciscan Guardian of Llanfaes, and Master Ralph of Brocton were appointed to inquire into the injuries done to church properties during the campaign. They reported on the fulfillment of their duties on June 9, 1285.[44] The Bangor priory, which had been burned down, was allowed £100 damages, the Rhuddlan priory £17 10s.[45]

The most impressive, though not the most important, personality among the Dominicans during this period was Anian of Nanneu,[46] Bishop of St. Asaph's. He adroitly made use of Llewelyn's political difficulties in 1276-77 to vindicate the rights of his diocese, yet apart from this short period the two men appear to have been friends to the end. Anian became bishop in 1268,[47] and in the following year received from Llewelyn a confirmation of the ancient privileges of his see.[48] In 1269 he was surety for an agreement between Llewelyn and his brother David; in 1272 he and the bishop of Bangor mediated between Llewelyn and another brother, Roderic.[49] In 1271-72 he acted for the former in a dispute with Gilbert Clare, Lord of Cardiff, and Humphry Bohn. He made a trip to Henry III, carrying back the reply that Edward on his return from the Holy Land would hear the case.[50] In 1274 a dispute, evidently concerning the rights of the see of St. Asaph, broke out between Llewelyn and the Bishop. The quarrel continued until November 1275 when Anian secured from the King a confirmation of his privi-

[44] P. R. O., *Thes. recept. scac., lib. A.*, fols. 381, 385, 388b, 391b (new pagination (E. 36/274). Two thousand pounds to be used in paying the damages were turned over to the Dominican prior and Ralph of Brocton in Oct. 1284 (*Cal. Close R., 1277-1288*, p. 281).

[45] *Thes. recept. scac., lib. A.*, fols. 381, 385,.

[46] The proof of this designation, instead of "Anian de Schonaw" as used by previous writers, e. g. *D. N. B.*, is detailed by R. C. Easterling, "Anian of Naneu, O. F. P.," *Flintshire Historical Society Journal*, 1914-15, pp. 10-11. The author also dispels the fiction that Anian accompanied Edward to the Holy Land as chaplain. The various disputes of Anian in attempting to vindicate the rights and privileges of his diocese are also sketched. I have based my studies of Anian's career on this essay.

[47] Royal approval obtained Sept. 24, 1268, *Cal. Pat. R., 1266-1272*, p. 260.

[48] Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, I, 497-8.

[49] *Cal. Close R. 1272-1279*, p. 506.

[50] *Cartae et Munimenta Glamorgan* (2nd ed.), III, 765-67.

leges, which was renewed in January, 1276, and November, 1277.[51] On November 17, 1276 the Bishop was present in council when war was declared against Llewelyn. He is the only Welsh bishop mentioned by name in the record. [52] Shortly afterwards, on December 7, Anian seized the opportunity presented by Llewelyn's political embarrassment to issue a lengthy list of grievances contained in twenty-nine clauses.[53] The combined pressure on Llewelyn was successful; a second charter of liberties was conceded to St. Asaph's, probably at this time though it is undated.[54] If this dispute and Anian's presence at the council in 1276, when the declaration of war was issued, caused an open rupture with Llewelyn, it was now healed, and from this time onwards friendly relations existed between the two.

In the meantime Anian continued on good terms with the English King. In May, 1276, he was allowed to visit Eleanor de Montfort, who was betrothed to Llewelyn but was at the time practically a prisoner of Edward.[55] Though the incident is not of much importance, it is conjectured with some probability that the interview was carried out on behalf of Edward, and by Anian, a Welshman, as a compliment to Eleanor.[56] The campaign of 1277 had no effect on the friendship between the King and Bishop. Anian was the recipient of the royal bounty several times in 1278, while the years 1281-82 witnessed joint negotiations on the part of both for the removal of the cathedral from St. Asaph's to Rhuddlan.[57] The plan was soon dropped, apparently because of the break between the two in 1282. The cause of this animosity is not clear, but it was probably induced by the burning of Anian's cathedral by the English shortly after the outbreak of hostilities with the Welsh in March. Though the destruction of the cathedral seems to have been an

[51] *Cal. Pat. R. 1272-1281*, pp. 112, 129, 235.

[52] *Cal. Close R. 1272-1279*, p. 360.

[53] *Councils*, I, 511-16.

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 519.

[55] *Cal. Pat. R., 1272-1281*, p. 139.

[56] Easterling, *op. cit.*, p. 19, where other possibilities are discussed.

[57] *Councils*, I, 529-30; Easterling, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-22.

accident, the Bishop excommunicated the English and left his diocese.[58] Despite the remonstrances of Archbishop Pecham at this action, Anian alone of the Welsh bishops did not reissue the sentence of excommunication against Llewelyn (April, 1282). As a result he was cited to appear before Pecham and answer for his disobedience.[59] In the meantime, the Bishop of Bath and Wells was placed in charge of the diocese, as it was not safe for Anian, perhaps owing to the hostility of the English army, to show himself there.[60] The King was genuinely incensed with him because of his excommunication of the English instead of the Welsh, and furthermore Anian had been contumacious in a case of patronage between himself and the Fitz-Alans of Oswestry, which had been appealed to the *Curia Regis*.[61] For two years the Bishop forfeited the royal favor and continued an exile from his see. The next step was a visitation of the diocese of St. Asaph by Pecham after Easter, 1284. The Archbishop had written to Edward I desiring the restoration of Anian before the visitation and had sent a letter to the Bishop advising the revocation of the excommunication against the English, but in each case he was unsuccessful. He continued his mediation, however, and wrote three times to Edward on Anian's behalf.[62] The latter, on Pecham's advice, made a friendly gesture by consenting to Edward's plan for removing the Abbey of Aberconway to Maenan.[63] The reconciliation was finally brought about sometime before September 27, 1284, when the King remitted to the Bishop 200 out of 500 marks, which were probably owed as a fine or peace money.[64] Friendly relations now continued between the two parties until the Bishop's death in 1293.

[58] *Councils*, I, 536-537.

[59] *Registrum Epistolarum Johannis Peckham* (*R. S.*), II, 422; *Councils*, I, 542.

[60] *Councils*, I, 541. It appears that Anian left his diocese voluntarily in the first instance, but at this juncture it would have been dangerous for him to attempt a return. Cf. Easterling, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-25.

[61] Easterling, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-3, 25.

[62] *Councils*, I, 553, 555, 568 (April, 19, June 11, July 3, 1284).

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 567.

[64] *Cal. Pat. R., 1281-1292*, p. 135. The money was to be spent for the repair of the Bishop's damaged buildings.

Anian's attitude toward Llewelyn at the outbreak of hostilities in 1276 was activated by consideration for the rights of his diocese. The quarrel had been going on for two years and hardly necessitated a political break, though Anian's presence in Council when war was declared by the English undoubtedly implied a threat to that effect. He astutely used political events to gain his own ends, and appears to have sympathized with Llewelyn once they were achieved. The issuance of the charter of privileges by the latter was most likely a move to secure the favor, at least the neutrality, of the Bishop, who was a man of outstanding personality and influence. He remained a friend of Edward during the campaign of 1277, perhaps being shrewd enough to foresee the turn of events and remain neutral. In 1282 mutual antagonism was awakened, Anian's partiality for the Welsh cause being determined by the destruction of his cathedral. Though in a letter of July 3, 1284, Pecham excuses Anian of any culpability in regard to the Welsh wars, the trend of events indicates that national feeling and sympathy for the political aspirations of his countrymen influenced Anian. He steadfastly refused to revoke the excommunication of the English soldiery and would not reissue the sentence against Llewelyn. There is no sign that he broke with Llewelyn, but his estrangement with Edward coincides exactly with the hostilities of 1282-84. After the death of Llewelyn the cause of the Welsh was lost, at least temporarily, and Anian was soon reconciled with Edward.

> It is a proof on the whole of his wholesome judgment that he knew how to use adroitly the political difficulties of his prince to the advantage of his diocese, he was able to remain a loyal friend of his own people, and also of Llewelyn until his death, if we except the years of 1274-1276, without forfeiting the useful friendship of the English king for more than the acute period of stress 1282-1284.[65]

A more intimate part in the settlement of the Welsh troubles was played by William of Southampton, Provincial 1273-78, and by Llewelyn and Ivor, Priors of Bangor and Rhuddlan. We have no

[65] Easterling, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-29.

indication of Southampton's previous experience in the diplomatic field; but in November, 1277, we find him a member of a commission to negotiate peace in Wales.[66] He and his fellow commissioners, Robert de Tybotot and Anthony Bek, were empowered to receive Llewelyn's oath and to confirm all things that had been treated of and agreed upon by the King's councillors and those of the Prince for the re-establishment of peace.[67] Following these negotiations Southampton seems to have lodged permanently at Westminster[68] and while there took part in a number of transactions. On January 18, 1278 he and other friends of both parties mediated in a dispute between Anthony Bek and Master Roger de Seiton touching the church of Briggehem.[69] On June 17, at Westminster, he witnessed a royal grant of new privileges to the Cinque Ports[70] and on June 23 was present at an agreement reached between Anian of Nanneu, Bishop of Asaph, and Thomas Cantilupe, Bishop of Hereford.[71] The seventeenth of July saw him and Anthony Bek arbitrating between the Bishop of Westminster and the monks of St. Swithin's.[72] He was present August 3 when Alexander of Scotland did homage and fealty to Edward I.[73] This record argues that William of Southampton was a man versed in affairs of state. His service on the peace commission the previous year can hardly have been his first experience. Without doubt he was on terms of intimacy with Edward I and was consulted concerning the policy to be pursued in the Welsh settlement. His death, later in 1278, prevented him from

[66] *Cal. Chancery Rolls (Various), 1277-1326*, p. 157. *Foedera*, I, 546.

[67] *Loc. cit.* A list of the articles of peace. *Foedera*, I, 545. They are briefly summarized by N. Trivet, *Annales Sex Regum Angliae* (London, 1845), pp. 297-98.

[68] *Registrum Thome de Cantilupo* (Canterbury and York Society), 284: . . . in palacio Regis apud Westmonasterium, in camera pioris provincialis Fratrum Praedicatorum . . .

[69] *Cal. Pat. R., 1272-1281*, p. 254.

[70] *Charters of the Cinque Ports* (ed. S. Jeake; London, 1728), p. 37.

[71] *Registrum Johannis de Pontissara* (C. Y. S.), II, 647-648.

[72] *Reg. Cantilupo*, p. 284.

[73] *Cal. Close R., 1272-1279*, p. 505.

witnessing the frustration of his efforts for peace when hostilities were renewed in 1282.[74]

When William of Southampton's part in the Welsh settlement came to an end, that of Llewelyn and Ivor, Priors of Bangor and Rhuddlan, began. Their co-operation was more humble but it lasted longer and was more arduous. On January 4, 1278 they, together with Guncelin de Batelesmer, Justice of Chester, Roger Lestrange, and Leonius, son of Leonius, were appointed to carry out part of the stipulations of the recently concluded peace treaty. They were to receive oaths from twenty men of every cantred still in the hands of Llewelyn, to take charge of the hostages that he was bound to deliver, to liberate all the prisoners taken while in the King's service, to make restitution of lands to those who had come to the King's peace, and to make amends for the injury done to the corn and goods of the King's men in Anglesey after the completion of the peace. They were also to inspect the lands that Llewelyn would give to his wife, Eleanor de Montfort, and to notify the King as to their assignment.[75] A repetition of this order informed the commissioners that at least two or three of their number were to act at all times, one of whom was always to be a knight, the other, one of the two priors.[76] On September 17, on the King's order, Ivor, Prior of Rhuddlan, restored to Llewelyn his hostages.[77]

In the execution of their instructions the commissioners evidently experienced a great deal of difficulty, for on December 4 Edward sent them a sharp note commanding them to proceed without delay in securing the restitution of corn in Anglesey and to finish the other things that still remained to be done in accordance with the tenor of their previous orders.[78] Four journeys to Snowdon and Anglesey were required to complete this work, and in June, 1281,

[74] C. F. R. Palmer, "Provincials of the Friar Preachers in England," *Archaeological Journal*, XXV (1878), 139.

[75] *Cal. Chancery Rolls (Various), 1277-1326*, p. 162. *Foedera*, I, 549.

[76] *Cal. Chancery Rolls, ibid.*, p. 167.

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 169.

[78] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

the Exchequer paid the commissioners ten pounds for the expenses incurred on these excursions.[79]

The employment of the Priors of Rhuddlan and Bangor, both Welshmen, to judge by their names, the stipulation that at least one of them must be present when the commission acted, and the return of the hostages by the hand of Ivor, undoubtedly represent part of Edward's general attitude of lenience toward Llewelyn after the peace of 1277. As Welshmen the Priors would be more acceptable to their countrymen and may have been placed on the commission to represent the interests of Llewelyn. Edward, on the other hand, perhaps felt sure of their impartiality and fairness, since the Rhuddlan friars especially had served his armies during the previous campaign.

III. *The Activities of William Hothum*

The final phase of Dominican engagement in royal affairs during the thirteenth century is almost the history of one friar, William Hothum, a man endowed with an array of brilliant talents that made him a success at every task to which he set his hand. Had he accomplished nothing else, his scholastic reputation won at Paris as a Master of Theology would have perpetuated his name, but he was twice provincial of his province, 1282-87, 1290-96; was appointed by Nicholas IV to the see of Llandaff, though he refused this post; and finally became archbishop of Dublin. He served sixteen years under Edward I (1282-98), taking a leading part in solving two of the major problems of the reign—the Scottish succession and the peace with France.

Behind these multifold achievements stood Hothum's character, causing them, influencing them, explaining them. "He was a man of exceedingly acute mind," writes Trivet, "was genial in conversation, placid in manner, sincerely religious, and acceptable in the eyes of all men."[80] Edward I recognized in him a man whom he could trust with the weightiest affairs of state, a man who could

[79] P. R. O., *Liberate Roll*, 9 Edw. I, m. 6.

[80] *Annales*, pp. 364-65; cf. MacInerny, *Irish Dominicans*, pp. 378-476, for a detailed survey of Hothum's life.

suggest solutions to tangled and complicated problems—" a discreet man." [81] His elegant manner, virtuous life, and prudence in spiritual and temporal affairs won the respect and admiration of Boniface VIII.[82] Intelligent, learned, cultured, and withal sincerely religious, he exemplified and embodied all that the Order wished for its sons.

Hothum's scholastic career need not detain us long. He lectured at Oxford in 1269,[83] and probably at Paris from 1270-82, where he attained the dignity of Master. It was this period that earned him a reputation throughout the Order [84] and fitted him for a trial of strength that awaited his return to England in 1282 as Provincial. The scholastic dispute which broke out between the Dominicans and Franciscans in 1284 rapidly developed into a tilt between the fiery Archbishop of Canterbury, John Pecham, and the cool, calculating genius of Hothum, in which the latter proved more than a match for the Franciscan.[85]

Apart from his services on behalf of the King little else is known of Hothum's diplomatic career. In 1291 he arbitrated a case be-

[81] *Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland* (ed. J. Stephenson; London, 1870), I, 9: ' et religiso viro et discreto fratre Guillelmo de Hothum ..." The criticism of MacInerny (*op. cit.*, p. 425) seems rather unjust: "The incidents of Hothum's career suggest clearly enough that he was an ambitious courtier. He was willing to execute the King's commands on all occasions, and to advocate the King's causes against all opponents." Cf. *ibid.*, p. 452. This is an imputation of unworthy motives, not in accord with the high character attributed to Hothum by Boniface VIII. Cf. Trivet, and Bernard of Gui (*Scriptores O. P.*, I, 458).

[82] A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum historiam illustrantia* (Rome, 1864), p. 161.

[83] A. G. Little, *Grey Friars in Oxford*, p. 334.

[84] *Scriptores O. P.*, I, 459 (the testimony of Bernard of Gui, O.P.). Whether Hothum was "intellectually the most brilliant member of the Pre-Reformation English province" (Jarrett, *English Dominicans*, p. 61) cannot be settled definitely until his writings and those of other English Dominicans, such as Fishacre, Kilwardby, and Robert Holcott have been thoroughly studied both as to content and to influence. Cf. MacInerny, *op. cit.*, pp. 384-7, for his scholastic career; pp. 465-6 for his works; also J. Russell, *Writers of Thirteenth Century England* (London, 1936), pp. 191-193.

[85] For this dispute see, MacInerny, *op. cit.*, pp. 390-420; Jarret, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-75.

tween Archbishop John Romeyn of York and his suffragan, the Bishop of Durham.[86] Two years later an attempt to vindicate the practice of his friars in hearing the annual confessions of parishioners involved him in a dispute with the same archbishop.[87] In the same year, at Westminster, he witnessed a bond from William of Pickering, Archdeacon of Nottingham, to Sir Nicholas de Segrave to keep the peace in respect of the church of Bonyngton.[88] In this connection, it is interesting to note that during his stay at Rome in 1289, while on an embassy for Edward, Hothum was consulted by the Pope concerning the infringement of ecclesiastical liberties in England and carried back a list of grievances to the King.[89]

We first find Hothum in the royal suite in 1282 when he accompanied the King to north Wales. Apparently the initial mission of his diplomatic career was a journey in October from Bath to Blayne, in Caermarthenshire. He returned to Edward at Rhuddlan in eleven days,[90] and then no more is heard of him until January, 1286, when he attested a grant made to Queen Eleanor, widow of Henry III.[91] In 1289 while travelling with the King in Gascony he was given his first major mission as second in command of an embassy to Pope Nicholas IV. Its objects were to secure a dispensation for the King's son in view of his contemplated marriage with Margaret of Scotland, to negotiate concerning the arrears of the annual tribute due to Rome, and to make arrangements regarding the crusading

[86] *Register of John le Romeyn*, 1289-1296 (Surtees Society, 123), II, 95.

[87] *Letters from Northern Letters* (R. S.), pp. 102-3. MacInerny, *op. cit.*, pp. 446-449.

[88] *Reg. Romeyn*, I, 313.

[89] In *Bullarium Ordinis Predicatorum*, II, 25-6, no. 14; *Calender of Papal Letters*, I, 511-26. The grievances are listed *B. O. P.*, II, 28-9, no. 19; *Cal. Papal Let.*, I, 526. In a letter to the Prior of Christchurch, Canterbury, Oct. 21, 1289, Hothum speaks of the Pope's complaints. *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Various* (London, 1901), I, 256.

[90] MacInerny, *Irish Dominicans*, pp. 388-9, where this mission is discussed. Russell, *op. cit.*, p. 192, says Hothum returned to St. Sena, but the reference in the original is more probably to the feast of St. Severus, Oct. 15, the day Hothum returned to court.

[91] *Cal. Pat. R. 1281-1292*, p. 218.

tithe.[92] On arriving at the Papal Court, Grandisson, the head of the embassy, went off to Apulia on other business, leaving Hothum from August 2 to November 2 to negotiate with the Pope. A reply was received to the royal petitions on October 7, but Hothum was detained another month. He departed for England on November 7, arriving there on December 31.[93] He next appears as part of the distinguished company which met at Clipstone Palace on October 14, 1290 when Edward solemnly made known his intention of going on crusade.[94]

With this background of training and experience, Hothum was well equipped to take a part in the question of the Scottish succession which arose in 1290 with the extinction of the royal family of Scotland. The numerous claimants appealed to Edward for adjudication and he promptly asserted his position as overlord of Scotland. On May 10, 1291, when all parties concerned met at Norham parish church near the frontier, Roger Barbazon, Justiciary of England, read a French address which boldly stated, and called upon the claimants to recognize, Edward's rights as suzerain of Scotland. Hothum had composed this address and had prompted Edward to press these claims at the outset of the deliberations.[95] During the negotiations, which were protracted into the succeeding year, Hothum and his companion served on the committee which heard the various claims. He was present at the assembly of June 5, 1292, and took part in the meetings of October 24, November 3, and November 17.[96] He was one of those who thought that the succession should be decided by English custom rather than by written

[92] *Historical Documents, Scotland*, I, 90-3. *D. N. B.*, XXVII, 414-416.

[93] Theiner, *Vetera Monumenta*, pp. 146-8; *Cal. Papal Let.*, I, 504. *Hist. Doc. Scot.*, I, 136. *Foedera*, I, 714, 719.

[94] *Foedera*, I, 741.

[95] *Chronicon Domini Walteri de Hemingburgh* (ed. H. C. Hamilton; London, 1849), II, 33: Ista petitio proposita fuit in Gallico per praedictum militem in praesentia regis et magnatum utriusque regni, et eam praeordinavit frater Willelmus de Hotham tunc prior provincialis fratrum Praedicatorum Angliae; . . .

[96] *Foedera*, I, 766. *Willelmi Rishanger Chronica et Annales* (R. S.), pp. 254-5, 260.

law [97] and declared that Balliol had a better claim to the throne than Bruce.[98] The award was finally made according to the principle of primogeniture, and Balliol was proclaimed King of Scotland.

A more active and important part fell to Hothum in bringing about peace with France in 1297-98. The causes and course of the war are matters of common knowledge and need not detain us beyond noting that, at the outset of the hostilities in 1294, Edward sent a Dominican, "who well knew his business," [99] Hugh of Manchester, later provincial, and William of Gainsborough, a Franciscan, to protest against the French retention of Edward's Gascon fortresses and to renounce his feudal allegiance to the French King.[100] The commission was not without its dangers, for on arrival at Calais the two emissaries were kept in prison for a week by the Count of Artois. They were then allowed to go on their way. Langtoft has preserved a versified account of the journey and of the speech made by Manchester in fulfillment of his mission.[101] Probably as part of the same business, he, together with Thomas Jorz, Prior of Oxford, was sworn in as a member of the King's council and sent to the Dominican general chapter, held at Strassburg in 1295, to explain *viva voce* certain affairs of the King.[102]

Hothum stepped into prominence in August, 1295, when in reply to the sermons delivered by the Cardinal Legates of Boniface VIII, who had come to England to promote peace with France, he discoursed on the text: "I will hear what the Lord God will speak in me, for he will speak peace unto his people." [103] He maintained that King Edward was an obedient son of the Pope, desirous of peace, and ready to receive and obey the commands of the Holy

[97] Rishanger, *op. cit.*, p. 255.

[98] *Ibid.*, p. 260.

[99] *The Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft* (R. S.), II, 204-6.

[100] *Cal. Pat. R., 1292-1301*, p. 85. Trivet, *Annales*, p. 331. Rishanger, *Chronica*, p. 142.

[101] *Op. cit.*, pp. 204-207.

[102] *Cal. Close R. 1288-1296*, p. 440.

[103] Ps. 84: 9.

See.[104] His part on this occasion and his authorship of the address delivered to the Scottish nobles in 1291 reveals Hothum as a master in the art of diplomatic composition. Each time much depended on the impression produced on the minds of the audience. In 1291 Hothum skillfully manipulated the circumstances to secure the acknowledgment of Edward's overlordship. Before the Cardinals in 1295 he had a double task. The King's campaign had to be justified in the eyes of his own subjects and of the Cardinals, who had also been sent to Philip. It had to be shown that the blame of the war rested with the French King and not with Edward, who, Hothum insinuated, was an unwilling participant, anxious for peace, and a dutiful son of the Pope. Hothum's part on both occasions testifies in no small way to his gifts as an accomplished and astute diplomat.

We are not surprised then when he sailed to France with Edward in 1297. He was now Archbishop-elect of Dublin and was consecrated during the campaign by his friend Anthony Bek, Bishop of Durham, probably in December while the army was resting behind the walls of Ghent.[105] Desultory fighting was carried on in Flanders, neither king risking an open conflict. The only solution lay in arbitration. Consequently a preliminary truce was signed in October, 1297,[106] followed by further negotiations at Courtrai[107] and Tournai.[108] Hothum played a leading part in all these proceedings, probably acting as mediator between the two kings,[109] In the peace, made at Tournai on January 31, 1298, an agreement was reached to refer the dispute to Pope Boniface VIII.[110] Hot-

[104] Hemingburgh, *Chronicon*, II, 66.

[105] MacInerny, *op. cit.*, p. 461. About this time, or in the next year, we find Hothum adjudicating as a member of the privy council with the Barons of the Exchequer (*op. cit.*, pp. 461-65).

[106] *Foedera*, I, 878-79.

[107] *Ibid.*, pp. 881-82.

[108] *Ibid.*, pp. 885-86.

[109] MacInerny, *op. cit.*, p. 466. T. F. Tout, *The Political History of England, 1216-1377* (London, 1905), p. 211.

[110] *Foedera*, I, 893-94.

hum presided over the English delegation to Rome, which accepted the award made by Boniface on June 14, 1298.[111] This event marked, at the same time, the conclusion of peace and the end of Hothum's career. He set out for England soon afterwards, but fell ill on the journey and died at Dijon on August 27, 1298. His remains were transferred to London by King Edward and deposited at Blackfriars' church near Ludgate.[112]

According to Trivet, Hothum was the leading figure in the declaration of the truce between Edward and Philip.[113] Hemingburgh added further details which confirm this testimony. When an impasse was reached in the hostilities, Hothum, on the strength of an earlier friendship probably dating from his professorship at Paris, asked and obtained an interview with Philip. As a result representatives of both kings met to arrange a truce.[114] Whether accurate or not this account is a valuable testimony to the tradition of diplomatic skill and prudence connected with Hothum's name.

Evidence from another source illustrates his patriotism and, incidentally, the social and political value of the friars. In 1296, after the conquest of Scotland, Hothum used his powers as provincial to appoint new vicars for the Scottish Dominicans and to station a great number of English friars in the Scottish priories, which were a part of the English province.[115] He probably took this step on behalf of the King to secure the peaceful penetration of Scotland, or to neutralize the nationalism of the Scottish friars. There was some reason therefore for Edward's "special affection and devotion"[116] toward the Order and more than mere liberality in his benefactions to the Dominican houses. Not only outstanding friars

[111] *Ibid.*, pp. 887, 894-95, 896-97.

[112] *Scriptores O. P.*, I, 460.

[113] *Annales*, p. 364: ...per cujus mediationem ex parte Anglicorum, et ducis Brittaniae ex parte Gallicorum, inter reges acceptatae sunt induciae, et ultra datos terminos saepius prorogatae.

[114] Hemingburgh, *Chronicon*, II, 160.

[115] MacInerny, *op. cit.*, p. 445, edits a letter from *Rotuli Scociae*, 24 Edw. I, m. 6: ... plures alios ejusdem ordinis fratres Anglicos in Scociam ordinaverat destinandos.

[116] *Loc. cit.*

but the rank and file served him faithfully. His last request for their services in our century, October 31, 1299, was for a type of assistance in closest harmony with their calling—their prayers on behalf of his expedition to Scotland.[117]

IV. *Miscellaneous Activities*

In completing our survey of the external activities of the English Dominicans, a number of instances in which friars acted as arbitrators, executors, or witnesses remain to be recorded. Most of the early cases occurred in Wales. In 1234 friars Anian and Llewelyn assisted Bishop Elias of Llandaff in arbitrating between Rhys Goch and Margam Abbey respecting the land lying between the waters of the Garw and the Ogmore and the forest rights thereof.[118] Two years later, two other friars, Richard and Philip, witnessed a charter of Griffin, son of Madoc, confirming grants made by his father to the abbot and convent of Valle Crucis.[119] In 1237 at Rosover (Newborough), friars Anian and Adam acted as witnesses to the grant of the Abbey of Penmon and all its possession to the canons of Insula Glannauch by Llewelyn, Prince of Aberfrau and Lord of Snowdon.[120] In 1261 two Dominicans, one of whom was Prior Adam of Bangor, and two Franciscans of Llanfaes were arbiters between Prince Llewelyn and Richard, Bishop of Bangor.[121]

Elsewhere in the province the friars were at times called upon for similar services. At Northampton in 1235, the Prior (with others) was called upon to decide the dispute which had arisen between Master Reginald de Boa, Rector of Great Paxton, Hunts., and some of his parishioners concerning their duty to repair the parish church.[122] The Prior of Pontefract, in 1267, was appointed by Archbishop Giffard to decide on the merits of Thomas Bek who

[117] *Cal. Close R., 1296-1302*, p. 322.

[118] *Cartae et Munimenta de Glamorgan* (2 ed.), II, 499-500.

[119] *Cal. Chart. R.*, II, 459.

[120] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, IV, 582; *Cal. Chart. R.*, II, 459-60.

[121] Haddan and Stubbs, *Concils*, I, 489.

[122] R. M. Serjeantson, *A History of the Six Houses of Friars in Northampton* (Northampton, 1911), p. 2.

had been presented by the priory and convent of St. John's of Pontefract to the vicarage of All Saints.[123] In 1272 at Norwich during the serious trouble between the citizens and the monks, the former, in an endeavor to end the trouble, sent certain Dominicans to mediate with the Prior but their efforts seem to have been unsuccessful.[124] In connection with the same dispute, Archbishop Kilwardby prolonged the suspension of the interdict, which had been lifted from Christmas Eve until Epiphany, 1272, until the Octave of Easter, on which day it was again extended. On Palm Sunday, 1276, he commissioned the Dominican Prior and the Franciscan Guardian to absolve all those of the city who had been excommunicated for their part in the burning of the abbey.[125] Shortly before Christmas in 1277, the Dominican Richard of Stratford acted as Kilwardby's representative in a dispute with St. Albans regarding the appropriation of some churches over which the Abbey possessed no episcopal rights.[126] At Pontefract in 1289, the Priors of Carlisle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Lancaster, York, and Pontefract settled a dispute between the Augustinian priory of Pontefract and the Cluniac monks of Mount Bretton. The conference took place at the Dominican priory.[127]

In view of the strict attitude taken by the general chapters in regard to the friars acting as executors, it may be interesting to cite a few cases in which the English friars were so engaged.[128] In 1238 John of St. Giles was executor of the will of King Henry's sister Joan.[129] The Prior of Derby, in 1242, was one of the execu-

[123] *Reg. Giffard* (Surt. Soc. 109), pp. 21-22.

[124] W. Rye, "The Riot between the Monks and Citizens of Norwich in 1272," in *Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany*, II, 20.

[125] *Bartholomaei de Cotton Historia Anglicana* (R. S.), pp. 150, 154.

[126] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii S. Albani* (R. S.), I, 431 ff. Cf. E. M. F. Sommer-Seckenforff, *Studies in the Life of Robert Kilwardby* (Rome, 1937), pp. 95-6, for a more detailed account of this episode.

[127] *The Victoria County History, Yorkshire*, III, 272. Dugdale, *Monasticon* (London, 1846), V, 123-24.

[128] The Lambeth Constitutions enacted in 1281 under Pecham forbade religious of any Order to act as executors. Wilkins, *Concilia*, II, 59.

[129] *Cal. Lib. R. 1226-1240*, p. 318. *Cal. Pat. R. 1232-1247*, p. 214.

tors of the will of Sir William Vernum. The details of the discharge of this duty illustrate the many distractions attendant on such an office and manifest one of the reasons of the order's legislators in opposing its exercise. The executors were so annoyed by the importunities of the many persons to whom the deceased was indebted that they had to issue notification "that as sundry persons were coming to them in sundry places and at sundry times demanding payment of many debts they appointed for all and each of them a fixed day and place at Derby, namely, the Wednesday before the feast of the Holy Trinity, that they might satisfy all rightful claims." On the appointed day all the "liquid" debts of the deceased were discharged, and proof was exacted of all others.[130]

V. *The English Dominicans and Representation*

There is one point, so far left unnoticed, which has awakened particular interest but seems to be incapable of proof. It has been proposed, and some attempt has been made to prove, that the Dominicans played a part in the development of the English representative systems—in Convocation and in Parliament.[131] A long chain of events and circumstances which seem to be more than mere coincidence suggests such a possibility. By 1220 the Dominicans, under the guidance of St. Dominic, had developed a completely representative system which framed legislation and elected superiors. The English province was established in 1221 and by 1250 Dominican friars were a permanent feature of English life. Throughout the thirteenth century various prominent Dominicans were in a position to make a contribution to the evolution of English constitutional law—Robert Bacon, John of St. Giles, John of Darlington, Hugh of Manchester, William Hothum. At different times they were intimate with, and served Henry III or Edward I. They and other Dominicans were in contact with such prominent men of the realm as Hubert de Brugh, Simon de Montfort, Peter de Roches,

[130] *The Manuscripts of the Duke of Rutland, Belvoir Castle* (Hist. MSS. Comm., 1905), IV, 27.

[131] E. Barker, *The Dominican Order and Convocation, A Study of the Growth of Representation in the Church during the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford, 1913).

Stephen Langton, Robert Grosseteste. The Dominican Robert Kilwardby and the Franciscan John Pecham, through whose Order Dominican influences were indirectly operative, were successively archbishops of Canterbury when Convocation received its final form.

The problem raised by these coincidences and the various points of resemblance between the Dominican and the English representative systems did not escape the notice of writers on English constitutional history. Ernest Barker, at the suggestion of Father Bede Jarrett, O.P., studied the problem from English sources and covered every possible contact between the friars and English statesmen. He makes the most of every resemblance and seeks in every direction for Dominican action in the constitutional field. But though he points to the possibility of Dominican influence, his historic sense prevented him from making definite claims. He was content to let the power of suggestion do the rest. Dr. E. M. Sait has nicely summarized his thesis:

> Professor Barker suggests that St. Dominic applied it [representation] to the organization of his great monastic order; that Archbishop Stephen Langton, borrowing from the Dominicans, applied it to the clerical convocations of Canterbury and York; that the State borrowed it from the Church; and that the makers of the House of Commons, Simon de Montfort and Edward I, were influenced by Dominican advisers.[132]

After examining each body of evidence, Barker was forced to admit that no direct contact between the two systems of representation can be shown. His results were always negative, as may be seen in the following quotation:

> These are all so many channels of indirect influence. Direct influence can hardly be proved. That Stephen Langton had felt their [the friars'] influence when he admitted representation as far as he did in 1226 is only conjecture. That de Montfort, who from early years had been connected with the Order, felt and expressed their influence is equally conjectural, if perhaps a little more possible. That Kilwardby, himself a Dominican and ex-prior of the English province, was translating their ideas into practice in 1273 and 1277 is, at the least, very

[132] *Political Institutions: A Preface* (New York, 1938), p. 489.

> probable. But we may content ourselves with asserting as a certainty, that they are the highest expression of the development of the representative principle in the thirteenth-century Church, and that the indirect influence of that expression must have been felt in the Church and to some extent in the State.[133]

We can expect nothing better from a new examination of the sources, though a recent writer seems to foster some such hope.[134] The English sources have been combed time and time again by serious scholars. Father Raymond Palmer, O.P., spent almost thirty years in the Public Record Office and during that time made a transcript of every notice touching the English Dominicans from their foundation in England until long after the Reformation. He was a careful scholar, and no mistakes have been detected in his transcripts. The new Dominican material found in the Public Record Office since his time is negligible, and every writer on English history since has been profoundly in his debt. Father Bede Jarrett, O.P., and Father Walter Gumbley, O.P., were thorough masters of the source material dealing with their province. They sifted the evidence with a spirit that originated in love, but each in turn failed to find a new light on our problem. The present writer spent three years working over the same materials and searching for new information, but likewise found nothing bearing on the problem. Father M. H. MacInerny, O.P. wrote rather extensive biographies of John of Darlington and William Hothum, but his examination of their careers furnishes no answer.[135] Likewise, nothing new has been discovered concerning the careers of Robert Bacon, John of St. Giles, or other English Dominicans. The argument from silence therefore is overwhelming and is almost tantamount to direct proof against Dominican influence.

In the face of these facts, it seems best to accept the judgment of competent writers on English constitutional history. They have rejected, and it seems rightly so, any Dominican influence on the

[133] *Op. cit.*, p. 75; cf. pp. 43, 51, 58-59.

[134] H. P. Tunmore, "The Dominican Order and Parliament," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXVI (1941), 479-89.

[135] *A History of the Irish Dominicans* (Dublin, 1916), pp. 297-378, 378-477.

representative system of England.[136] Furthermore, Sait offers very convincing proof for the probable origin of English representative institutions in Spain and southern France before the foundation of the Dominican Order or independently of its influence. The development of his argument is so cogent and his conclusions are so convincing that they necessitate the abandonment of the hypothesis of Dominican influence. If there were any such influence it merely served to swell a stream that was already in full course.

VI. *Conclusion*

The obvious conclusion of our study is that the total effect of the Dominicans on English life must have been extensive and profound. Even the fragmentary nature of our source material, apparent in the foregoing study, warrants such a conclusion. It is placed beyond all doubt when we recall the primary work of the friars in the cloister, in the pulpit, in the confessional — activities which were purposely excluded from the scope of this essay. In regard to the external activities which we have attempted to sketch, it is instinctively felt that the veil has been lifted only occasionally. In the case of men like Darlington and Hothum, only the most important moments of their careers have been captured by history—or else the sources record trivia, like the witnessing of deeds, in which we have little interest save as testimonies of their continuing public activity.

WILLIAM A. HINNEBUSCH

Providence College

[136] Sait, *op. cit.*, pp. 489-93; cf. pp. 493-99 concerning the diffusion of representative institutions from Spain and southern France. D. Pasquet, *An Essay on the Origins of the House of Commons* (trans. R. G. D. Laffan, Cambridge, 1925), pp. 19-20. Most authors do not refer to our problem, being content with a general denial of clerical influence; cf. G. B. Adams, *Constitutional History of England* (rev. ed.; New York, 1934), p. 173.

THE KULTURKAMPF AND EUROPEAN DIPLOMACY, 1871-1875 *

THE history of the struggle between the Catholic Church and the Bismarckian German Empire is, in its internal aspects, well known.[1] The interrelation of the Kulturkampf and the diplomatic history of Europe—especially from 1871 to 1875—has, however, not received detailed study. Yet any examination of the diplomatic documents of the pre-1914 era—*Die Grosse Politik der europäischen Kabinette* or the *Documents diplomatiques français*—shows clearly that the Kulturkampf was connected, both in origins and in development, with the diplomacy of those years. The purpose of this study is to try to analyze two problems: first, the extent to which Bismarck was moved, in originating the Kulturkampf, by considerations of foreign policy; second, the manner in which the so-called "international Kulturkampf" of Bismarck influenced the course of European diplomacy from 1871 to 1875.

The motives behind the origins of the Kulturkampf are complex. To depict it merely as a continuation of the Catholic-Protestant antagonism begun at Sadowa and carried further at Metz and Sedan; to maintain that "Protestant Prussia, having defeated the Apostolic Monarchy and the Eldest Daughter of the Church, must necessarily come into conflict with the Church itself, that in the very establishment of the German Empire the Kulturkampf was, so to speak, pre-established,"[2] is certainly to be guilty of oversimplification. That picture ignores the whole formidable current of antireligious ideas that penetrated Germany in the second half of the nineteenth century.[3] Bismarck denied that he was himself

* Paper read at the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, Chicago, December 29, 1941.

[1] The best treatment of the whole Kulturkampf is Georges Goyau, *Bismarck et l'église: le Kulturkampf* (4 volumes, Paris, 1911).

[2] This appears to have been the notion held by Windthorst, the leader of the Centrum, who one day remarked to Benningsen, the leader of the National Liberals, "the Kulturkampf dates from the field of the battle of Sadowa." Goyau, *op. cit.*, I, x-xi; xiv.

[3] *Ibid.*, I, xx-xxvii; see also Martin Spahn, "Kulturkampf," in *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913 edition), VIII, 704.

an enemy of religion or that he had any quarrel with the Pope as a religious leader;[4] instead, he insisted he was merely opposed to the political influence of the Church. As a matter of fact he would not have objected even to the political influence of the Pope or of the Church if he had been able to manipulate that influence for his own purposes. "Like Napoleon, he believed that the only proper use for the Church was as a department of State; and his ideal Bishop was a sort of Prussian grenadier or heavy dragoon with a cassock over his jack-boots."[5] Bismarck was even prepared to offer Pius IX an asylum in Germany should it become necessary for the Pope to leave Italy; the Chancellor felt that it "would vaccinate the Germans to see the Pope as an old man, smoking his cigar."[6] In return for Bismarck's friendship and alliance, the Pope was to induce the Center Party to rally to the support of imperial unity,[7] and to make clear to the world that the "highest authority of the Church did not approve of the aggressions against the State in which respectable members of the Church had become involved by malcontent laymen."[8] Bismarck declared that he opposed the Center Party because it was "an attempt to build a political party on sectarian foundations."[9] But it seems obvious that "a Roman

[4] Julius Clausen, *Bismarck und der Katholizismus in den Jahren, 1851-1871* (Hamburg, 1934), pp. 59-60; William L. Langer, *European Alliances and Alignments, 1871-1890* (New York, 1931), pp. 36-37.

[5] John J. O'Shea, "Bismarck's Decline and Fall", in *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, XXIII (October, 1898), 842.

[6] E. L. Woodward, "The Diplomacy of the Vatican under Pope Pius IX and Leo XIII", *Journal of British Institute of International Affairs* (May, 1924), 127-128.

[7] See a conversation between the Prussian Ambassador at the Vatican, Harry von Arnim, and the British Minister to Bavaria, Sir Robert Morier, in Mrs. Rosslyn Wemyss, *Memoirs and Letters of the Right Honorable Sir Robert Morier G.C.B., from 1826 to 1876* (2 volumes, London, 1911), II, 251-257; also *Bismarck, Die gesammelten Werke* (19 volumes in 15, Berlin, 1924-1925), VI, c, #18, p. 16; and S. William Halperin, *Italy and the Vatican at War* (Chicago, 1939), pp. 180-181.

[8] Bismarck to Tauffkirchen, the Bavarian Minister in Rome, January 12, 1872, in *Bismarck, Die gesammelten Werke*, VI, c, #18, p. 15 (Cited hereafter as *Bismarck, G.W.*).

[9] See Bismarck's speech in the Prussian Lower House, January 30, 1872, in *Bismarck, G.W.*, XI, #23, pp. 224-231.

Catholic party pledged to support the government would hardly have been objectionable."[10] What really gave Bismarck nightmares was the fact that the Center Party was composed of many elements not in sympathy with the new German Empire — the Hanoverians, the Alsace-Lorrainers, the Bavarians, the Poles;[11] and the fact that, in his mind, the Center Party constituted a "mobilization against the State" of the forces of "Polonismus and Welfentum" and a perpetuation of the "bacillus of particularism in the veins of Germany."[12] To Bismarck, fearful that sooner or later Germany would have to face a war of revenge on the part of France, and perhaps of Austria, this "bacillus of particularism" was especially worrisome, since he felt that in the event of war, these groups might come forward as "fifth columnists" inside Germany, in support of France or Austria. This was true in a particular degree of the Polish movement in the eastern provinces, which movement Bismarck regarded as the most virulent germ in the bacillus of particularism; the Kulturkampf was certainly an attempt to fight it both from the national and the international side. The growth of the Polish nationality in the eastern provinces, and, more especially, the influence of the Polish nobility—e.g., the Radziwills — who desired to break away from the new German Empire and re-establish the old Poland with its ancient pre-partition boundaries, were topics on which Bismarck fulminated time and again, both in public speeches and private conversations.[13] He

[10] William H. Dawson, *The German Empire, 1867-1914, and the Unity Movement* (2 volumes, New York, 1919), I, 425.

[11] Langer, *op. cit.*, 37; see also a note from Bismarck to Schweinitz, the German Ambassador in Vienna, April 16, 1872, in *Bismarck, G.W.*, VI, c, note to #23, p. 18; and Wemyss, *op. cit.*, II, 256-257.

[12] *Bismarck, G.W.*, XI, #23, p. 228; also a conversation between Bismarck and Lothar Bucher in Goyau, *op. cit.*, I, xxvii.

[13] The evidence on this point is ample. Otto von Bismarck, *Bismarck, the Man and the Statesman* (English edition of the *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, 2 volumes, New York, 1898), II, 135-142; Bismarck's speech in the Prussian Lower House, February 9, 1872, in *Bismarck, G.W.*, XI, 242-244; Moritz Busch, *Bismarck, Some Secret Pages of His History* (2 volumes, New York, 1898), II, 31-32, alludes to an article in the *Kölnische Zeitung*, February 12, 1872, written by Dr. Busch from notes supplied by the Press Chief of the

even professed to fear the influence of the Polish nobility as a support of the Socialist Party as well as of the Center Party.[14] For it was not the Center Party alone or even the Polish movement in Germany itself that Bismarck feared as much as the alliances they might make with the Papacy or with revenge-seeking or clerical-dominated governments in France or Austria.[15]

The older and still more widely held point of view on the genesis of the Kulturkampf is that the motives behind Bismarck's participation were originally and primarily internal, and that he was only later "led gradually by events to carry his attack across the German frontiers."[16] The other theory holds that the whole Kulturkampf was part and parcel of Bismarck's foreign policy, not only in its later execution, but in its original conception.[17]

This latter theory may be briefly summarized. Since Bismarck felt that France would some day attempt a war of revenge against Germany, it was important that France be kept isolated and incapable of alliances. Two things would contribute to this end: first to prevent the re-establishment of a chauvinistic monarchy in

German Foreign Office, embodying the ideas of Bismarck. Professor J. F. von Schulte in his *Lebenserinnerungen* (2 volumes, Berlin, 1908), I, 317-320, states that Emperor William I in his youth had admired the sister of Count William Radziwill. See also a talk between Bismarck and Hohenlohe on the Polish aspects of the Kulturkampf in Prince Chlodwig zu Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, *Memoirs* (2 volumes, English edition, New York, 1906), II, 159-160.

[14] See a letter purportedly written by Count Platen, a leader of the emigrant Poles in Zurich, to the editor of the *Dziennik Poznanski* urging active Polish support of both the Center and the Socialists, on the theory that a social revolution in Germany would also bring about the freeing of Poland. This letter Bismarck brought to the attention of William I, February 17, 1872. *Bismarck, G.W.*, VI, c, note 2 to #17, p. 14; Busch, *Bismarck*, II, 41.

[15] Langer, *Alliances*, 36-37; Arthur Rosenberg, *The Birth of the German Republic* (London, 1931), p. 11; Woodward, *loc. cit.*, pp. 127-128; Hohenlohe, *Memoirs*, II, 72-73.

[16] This view is still held by E. Malcolm Carroll, *Germany and the Great Powers, 1866-1914* (New York, 1938), p. 102; also by Hans Herzfeld, *Deutschland und das geschlagene Frankreich, 1871-1873* (Berlin, 1924), pp. 193-194.

[17] The chief proponent of this theory is Adalbert Wahl, in his *Vom Bismarck der 70er Jahre* (Tübigen, 1920), pp. 35-65, and in briefer form in his *Deutsche Geschichte, 1871-1914* (4 volumes, Stuttgart, 1929), I, 342-344. It is supported, with some moderation, by Langer, *Alliances*, p. 36.

France; and second, more immediately, to bring the three great Powers — Russia, Austria, and Italy — into as close relations with Germany as possible. The Kulturkampf would serve these purposes neatly. Russia, since the 1863 revolt in Poland, had been carrying on vigorous war against the Roman Catholic Church in Russian Poland.[18] The Kulturkampf, as common action against Polish Catholicism allied with the Papacy, might serve not only to smash the Polish movement inside Germany, but also to tie Russia closer to Germany, and to hold her aloof from a France that was coming to be controlled by a clerical pro-monarchist majority.[19] Italy, after 1870 antagonistic to the Pope, might also turn to a Germany engaged in a war against the Papacy, as a powerful ally, and be turned back from any alliance with France. In relation to Austria, the aim was a bit different. Here, it was Bismarck's aim to carry Austria into a Kulturkampf of its own, thus not only estranging it from France but also bringing it closer to Italy;[20] at the same time, such a policy would remove Bismarck's fear of a bargain between the Papacy on the one hand and Poland and Austria on the other.[21]

This theory of the origins of the Kulturkampf probably should not be accepted without reservation. But it would be foolish to deny that Bismarck desired to isolate France, and that he was anxious to attract to Germany all those powers which might be

[18] For the details of the anti-Church campaign of the Russian government in Poland, see Wahl, *Vom Bismarck der 70er Jahre*, pp. 49-50, 58-60; Bryan J. Clinch, "A Hero of Our Day", in *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, XXI (April, 1896), 130-141; Reuben Parsons, "The Later Religious Martyrdom of Poland", *ibid.*, XXIII (January, 1898), 71-96.

[19] Wahl, *Vom Bismarck der 70er Jahre*, pp. 49, 60-63, makes much of this Russian angle as one of Bismarck's motives. Carroll, *Germany and the Great Powers*, p. 102, and Herzfeld, *Deutschland und das geschlagene Frankreich*, pp. 193-194, concede that Bismarck might have had France in mind, but ridicule the theory that it would have been "necessary to begin a great internal conflict in order to keep the friendship of the Tsar's Empire." Herzfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

[20] Wahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-58.

[21] Woodward, *loc. cit.*, pp. 127-128.

possible French allies.[22] The Kulturkampf was therefore, for Bismarck, a two-fold weapon—a means of combatting the pro-French, pro-Papal particularism of the Center Party inside Germany, and a means of promoting his foreign policy of isolating France.

Now, to answer the second question proposed at the beginning of this article—how did the so-called "international Kulturkampf" influence the course of European diplomacy from 1871 to 1875? First, a brief summary of the diplomatic situation in Europe in 1871 is necessary to serve as an introduction to the answer. France had just been defeated by the new German Empire, and although Bismarck was convinced that another war was inevitable, prostrate France in 1871 was obviously in no condition to attempt such a struggle immediately. Clever diplomacy might isolate France, deprive her of all possible allies, and thus render her helpless. Thus it was Bismarck's game to foster good relations between Germany and Russia, Germany and Austria, Germany and Italy, leaving France out in the cold. France was always the central problem. But, during 1871, it was not an acute problem, for the huge indemnity exacted by Bismarck after the Franco-Prussian War and the occupation of French territory rendered her impotent. At the same time, the so-called clerical problem complicated relations between France and Italy, and further eased Bismarck's mind.

The loss of the temporal power by the Pope and the subsequent seizure of Rome by the new Italian Kingdom outraged the sentiments of French Catholics, inasmuch as the French government had acted as protector of the papal territories since 1848. The government of Thiers was in a difficult position. While he wanted "to protect the personal independence and religious liberty of the Pope,"[23] Thiers "had no desire to menace Italian unity or to reestablish the temporal power."[24] He wished to strengthen relations

[22] The French diplomats had this viewpoint; see a letter of the French Ambassador in Berlin, M. Elie de Gontaut-Biron, in *Occupation et libération du Territoire* (2 volumes, Paris, 1900), I, 241.

[23] *Documents diplomatiques français, 1871-1914* (Paris, 1929–), 1st Series, Volume I, #23, pp. 44-45. Hereafter referred to as *D.D.F.*, I, since all references are to the First Series.

[24] *D.D.F.*, I, #6, pp. 15-16.

with the Quirinal,[25] and to avoid any chance of "throwing Italy into the arms of Prussia"; [26] but, at the same time, he did not wish "to add to the woes of the Pope." It was necessary for Thiers to try to placate both the Quirinal and the Vatican.

Thus, when the question of transferring the embassies from Florence to Rome arose in June, 1871, and Cardinal Antonelli, the Papal Secretary of State, protested that such action "would consecrate the spoliation and give a sort of complicity to the Powers in all that has taken place," [27] Thiers followed the lead of the other Powers, and transferred the French Embassy to Rome "so as not to prejudice relations with Italy." [28] A strong campaign on the part of some of the French bishops, culminating in a petition to the National Assembly asking some "immediate remedy for the intolerable situation imposed on the Sovereign Pontiff by the Italian government," led Thiers to point out that "there is an Italian Kingdom which has taken a place among the considerable powers of Europe . . . you must not impose on us a policy the result of which you would repudiate publicly, that is to say, war." [29]

Despite these assurances of Thiers, the Italian government was disquieted, and Italian public opinion began to fear the future policy of France.[30] Doubtless the presence of the French gunboat *Orenoque* off Citta Vecchia did nothing to allay this disquiet. And Thiers himself was certainly not anti-papal. In November, 1871, when the Italian Parliament met in Rome for the first time, the French Government told its ambassador to the Vatican that, while he should avoid taking the initiative in any suggestions, he might, if the Pope should, *sua sponte*, decide to leave Rome and elect to come to France, then let Pius IX know that "the doors of France are open to him", since it was not to be concealed from anyone,

[25] *D.D.F.*, I, #23, pp. 44-45.

[26] *D.D.F.*, I, #13, p. 29.

[27] *D.D.F.*, I, #11, p. 28.

[28] *D.D.F.*, I, #78, p. 101; #100, p. 119.

[29] *D.D.F.*, I, footnote to #34, p. 52; E. Malcolm Carroll, *French Public Opinion and Foreign Affairs, 1870-1914* (New York, 1931), p. 50.

[30] *D.D.F.*, I, #35, p. 53; Wahl, *Vom Bismarck der 70er Jahre*, pp. 52-54.

Pope or Italian Kingdom, that " as a fugitive he would be assured of finding in France the hospitality which our traditions and duty as a Catholic Power give him the right to expect." [31] Disquiet gradually increased in Italian circles, and in April, 1872, Visconti-Venosta, the Italian Foreign Minister, told Fournier, the French Ambasador, that in his judgment the Papacy was counting on the restoration of the temporal power by the aid of France.[32] Thiers' reply was hardly as soothing to Italy as it might have been. Fournier was asked to say that while France had no desire to cause the King of Italy any difficulty and earnestly hoped for peace, she did insist that the Pope's life be made tolerable and warned that there would be no greater peril for Italian unity than the Pope's leaving Italy. " I will do nothing to urge him to quit the Vatican. But others may. The Pope must be left completely free, respected, venerated, if Catholics are not soon to revolt against the existing situation either in France or in Europe." [33]

It was at this point that Bismarck began to take an active interest in the Franco-Italian situation. By this time, the domestic Kulturkampf had got well under way. In July, 1871, the Roman Catholic section of the Ministry of Worship had been abolished; in December, 1871, the *Kanzelparagraf* or Pulpit Law, with its celebrated " india-rubber clause ", had been inserted in the Criminal Code; and in January, 1872, the School Inspection Law had been introduced into the Prussian Legislature. March 6, 1872, Bismarck really began to link up the fight against the Catholic Church with his foreign policy. In the Prussian House of Lords, he read from a diplomatic report which declared that the revenge longed for in France was being prepared by the religious divisions in France, and added that " an influential part of the French clergy, which is directed by Rome, puts itself at the service of French policy because the hopes of the restoration of the States of the Church coincide with it." [34] Bismarck is said to have feared that French

[31] *D.D.F.*, I, #83, pp. 104-105

[32] *D.D.F.*, I, #119, p. 138.

[33] *D.D.F.*, I, #120, pp. 137-140.

[34] *D.D.F.*, I, footnote 3 to #115, pp. 134-135.

intervention in Italy on behalf of the Pope would meet with the sympathy of the German Catholics and bishops.[35]

Precisely at this time, several events combined to arouse Bismarck's suspicions and speed up the pace of the Kulturkampf. The new French Army Bill of April, 1872, alarmed both the German Emperor and Bismarck, and the military men told the "Emperor it would be better to fight France before she is ready rather than after; but Bismarck who scorns the generals, advises the Emperor to fight France morally through Rome and the Catholic alliances against united Germany."[36] The refusal of Pius IX to accept as the German Empire's first Ambassador to the Vatican, Cardinal Hohenlohe, irked Bismarck, too. And shortly after, on May 14, 1872, in a speech in the Diet, he issued the boast that constituted in effect his declaration of war against the Vatican: "Have no fear—to Canossa we shall not go, either in body or in spirit."

The quickening of the antipapal drive soon began. Internally, it was marked by the passage of the laws against the Jesuits in July, 1872. Externally, it was marked by the achieving of closer relations with Austria and Russia, and the virtual isolation of France through the meeting of the three Emperors in September, 1872. For Bismarck was much worried over a possible Austro-French coalition based on Catholic sympathies.[37] He had engineered the substitution of Count Andrassy instead of the pro-Catholic Count von Beust late in 1871;[38] and Andrassy now made his position

[35] Busch, *Bismarck*, II, 47-48.

[36] Lord Newton, *Lord Lyons* (2 volumes, London, 1913), II, 29, quoting Odo Russell, the British Ambassador in Berlin, to Lyons, April 27, 1872.

[37] Busch wrote an article for *Die Grenzboten* in March, 1872, expressing the idea (presumably Bismarck's) that if France were to intervene on behalf of the Pope, her natural ally would be found in Vienna; Busch, *Bismarck*, II, 47-48.

[38] Andrassy was Imperial Foreign Minister in the Auersperg Ministry; his policy was generally pro-Bismarckian in contrast to the pro-French policy of Beust, who had sought to embarrass Bismarck. Andrassy was, however, unable to get rid of Beust altogether; Beust became Ambassador in London. Thus there still lurked the fear in Bismarck's mind that the pro-French orientation had not been completely abandoned; see a recent discussion of Andrassy in George Hoover Rupp, *A Wavering Friendship, Russia and Austria, 1876-1878* (Cambridge, 1941), pp. 63-71.

clear. In February, 1872, in reply to a deputation requesting that the Pope be offered a refuge in Austria, he declared that it was his conviction that no other Catholic State could offer to the Pope as attractive an asylum as that which he had in Rome.[39] In April, 1872, Andrassy told the German Ambassador that if in a war between Germany and France the latter tried to get allies on a Catholic basis, she would have nothing to hope for in Austria-Hungary.[40] Coming so close to Bismarck's Canossa speech, this was significant. But, in July, 1872, after the passage of the Jesuit-laws, an article in the *Pester Reform* pointed out that Andrassy ought not to be too slavishly subject to the German Chancellor, since there might still be a question whether Bismarck had done well to raise a contest to the death between the temporal and the spiritual power.[41] Andrassy denied having inspired this article, but it was clear that he had no desire to follow Bismarck too far.

The same thing was true of Russia. Gorchakov early in 1872 sought an armistice with the Pope; three bishops were named for Poland, and two for Russia; and several times in 1872, Gorchakov told the British Ambassador that Russia desired to remain on a friendly footing with the Pope, and that he would not be seduced by Bismarck into an attitude hostile to the Pope and the Catholic subjects of the Tsar.[42] All this was not to Bismarck's liking. And the meeting of the three Emperors in September, 1872, gave him a welcome opportunity to show France that she was indeed isolated and could not really count on aid from either Tsarist Russia or Catholic Austria.[43]

[39] Eduard von Wertheimer, *Graf Julius Andrassy, Sein Leben und Seine Zeit* (3 volumes, Stuttgart, 1913), II, 193-194.

[40] *Ibid.*, II, 196; Busch, *Bismarck*, II, 61-62.

[41] Wertheimer, *Andrassy*, II, 196-198; compare this estimate of the wisdom of the Kulturkampf with that made by Lyons to Russell, May 7, 1872; Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II, 30-31.

[42] Wahl, *Vom Bismarck der 70er Jahre*, pp. 65-66.

[43] Langer, *op. cit.*, p. 21. This meeting paved the way for the formal Three Emperors' Entente (May–June, 1873), for the next years, the foundation stone of Bismarck's foreign policy.

The close of 1872 and the opening of 1873 now saw the internal side of the Kulturkampf enter into its most vigorous phase. The way was paved for this by the protests of the Pope and the German bishops in the latter part of 1872 against the anti-clerical measures of the German government.[44] The Catholic resistance to the Kulturkampf increased. The *Mainzer Verein* (Association of German Catholics), a much less moderate group than the Center Party, soon numbered 200,000 members. The Minister of Worship, Herr Falk, now introduced the series of four laws—the first in November, 1872, the latter three in January, 1873—relating to the education, authority, and administration of the German clergy that are generally known as the Falk Laws or May Laws (since they were finally passed in May, 1873). On January 30, 1873, the Bishops of Prussia protested in advance against the forthcoming legislation. May 2, they issued a pastoral letter explaining to the faithful the necessity of passive resistance; and on May 26, they addressed the Prussian Government, declaring their intention of obeying the laws of God rather than those of man, and announcing that they would not co-operate in the execution of the Falk Laws. The clergy and Catholic people of Prussia followed their lead.[45] Thus the internal progress of the struggle against the Church was far from smooth, when the whole question of French relations was reopened in May, 1873, by the downfall of Thiers and the accession to the presidency of Marshal MacMahon.[46]

[44] June 24, 1872, the Pope had told the German Catholics in Rome that Bismarck had placed himself at the head of the persecutors of the Church. The German bishops, assembled at Fulda, issued a memorial, September 20, 1872, pointing out that recent laws clashed with certain rights of the Church recognized by both national and international law. At the Christmas consistory, Pius IX took occasion to reprove Bismarck.

[45] Martin Spahn, "Kulturkampf", in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, VIII, 706-707; Dawson, *German Empire*, I, 439-442.

[46] The chronological relation of these events is significant. Langer, *Alliances*, p. 36, is not quite accurate in referring to the May Laws as "the first legislation of the Kulturkampf." He feels that the May Laws, the fall of Thiers, and the St. Petersburg Convention were closely related. But it ought to be borne in mind that the Falk or May Laws had actually been introduced six months earlier, long before there was any danger of the fall of Thiers. The St. Petersburg Convention, too, seems to have had little immediate connection

The Duc de Broglie, who became both Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, was a devout Catholic, and the clericals in France expected the government to pursue a foreign policy more favorable to the claims of the Papacy.[47] Bismarck was greatly alarmed by the coming of MacMahon, who was both a Catholic and a royalist, and privately referred to the new president as the "marshal of revenge";[48] he felt that Macmahon would pave the way for the restoration of the monarchy in France, and considered a monarchy, militaristic, and pro-papal in its tendencies, a greater danger to Germany than republican France because it would be more "eligible for alliances."[49] Broglie tried at once to convince Europe that France would be "resolutely conservative, that is, pacific in foreign affairs, moderate in domestic affairs."[50] But the activity of the clerical press in France, and especially the attempts to bring about a restoration of the monarchy by reconciling the rival Bourbon and Orleanist factions, continued to alarm Bismarck.[51] True, these

with either the fall of Thiers or the course of the Kulturkampf, but rather to have been the logical, natural sequel to the 1872 meeting of the Three Emperors.

[47] Notice the comments of the clerical *Univers*, May 31, 1873 and June 20, 1873, in Carroll, *French Public Opinion*, pp. 51-52.

[48] Elie de Gontaut-Biron, *Ma Mission en Allemagne, 1872-1873* (Paris, 1906), pp. 349-350.

[49] See a letter from Bismarck to Schweinitz, June 4, 1873, in *Die Grosse Politik der europäischen Kabinette, 1871-1914* (edited by Friedrich Thimme, Johannes Lepsius and Albrecht Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Berlin, 1922-1927), I, note to #95, p. 189. Hereafter referred to as *G.P.* See also his instructions to Arnim, *G.P.*, I, #92, pp. 155-156; #95, pp. 157-162; conversations with Lucius von Ballhausen and with Bernhard Oettigen, in *Bismarck, G.W.*, VIII, #60, p. 84; #62, pp. 86-88.

[50] *D.D.F.*, I, #207, pp. 238-240; Duc de Broglie, *An Ambassador of the Vanquished: Viscount Elie de Gontaut-Biron's Mission to Berlin, 1871-1877* (London, 1896), pp. 91-92.

[51] *D.D.F.*, I, #209, pp. 241-242. During June, 1873, the Pilgrimage of Chartres occasioned demands for the re-establishment of the temporal power of the Pope, and the punishment of Italy; and also for a new deliverer in the person of the rightful King of France, by the Bishop of Poitiers. Franz Despagnet, *Le République et le Vatican, 1870-1906* (Paris, 1906), pp. 31-32; Woodward, *loc. cit.*, p. 128. The move for the reconciliation of the Bourbons and Orleans is alleged to have had the support of Pope Pius IX; Woodward, *loc. cit.*, p. 128; Gontaut-Biron, *Ma Mission en Allemagne*, p. 108, note.

efforts foundered when the aged Count de Chambord refused to give up the white flag of the Bourbons and accept the tricolor,[52] but Macmahon was still there to keep the throne warm for the Orleans candidate when the obstinate Chambord should depart this vale of tears.[53] Bismarck professed to see in the recrudescence of religious zeal in France an encouragement to the beleaguered Catholics of Germany.[54] Many individual Germans, too, felt that the Broglie ministry might try to intervene in Italy on behalf of the Pope.[55]

This same fear of French policy agitated the Italians. Minghetti, the Italian Premier, expressed grave anxiety at the possible direction of French policy and stated that if religious matters were made the basis of French policy, France "would throw us despite ourselves into the arms of Prussia."[56] As a matter of fact, Bismarck was entirely willing to have Italy thrown into his arms, because he was again haunted by his old "nightmare of coalitions", and was worried that the Pope might serve as an intermediary between a French monarchy dominated by the Clerical Right and Catholic Austria.[57] To counteract this supposed danger, he cultivated Italy, which was at the time engaged in an anti-clerical campaign of its own. In June, 1873, the Italian government promulgated the new laws on religious corporations, which confiscated some four hundred convents of the larger religious orders.[58] Against

[52] Pius IX is said to have remarked, a bit puzzled, "et tout ça pour une serviette"; Woodward, *loc. cit.*, p. 128.

[53] A recent book, Carlton J. H. Hayes, *A Generation of Materialism, 1871-1900* (New York, 1941), pp. 63-64, calls the Legitimists "a reactionary party . . . seeking . . . to put the austere grandson of Charles X on a throne decorated with the lilies of the Bourbon family and the oriflamme of Jeanne d'Arc and dedicated to a close union with the altar. . . ."

[54] Broglie, *Ambassador of the Vanquished*, pp. 122-123, 128-130.

[55] Goyan, *op. cit.*, II, 61; Gontaut-Biron, *op. cit.*, p. 381; Herzfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 278.

[56] *D.D.F.*, I, #211, pp. 243-244.

[57] Gabriel Hanotaux, *Contemporary France* (4 volumes, Westminster, 1903), I, 528-529.

[58] E. Lécanuet, *L'église de France sous le troisième république, 1870-1910* (3 volumes, Paris, 1910), I, 169-170.

this law the Pope protested in a consistory of July 25, 1873. And when, August 7, 1873, Pius IX addressed to the German Emperor a solemn letter appealing to William I against the treatment of Catholics in Germany, Bismarck was greatly irritated.[59] His reaction really took two forms—first, to try to attach Italy to the newly created Three Emperors' Alliance, and second, to set in motion an international Kulturkampf (which was to carry through the next two years) by demanding that the French government take action to moderate the outspokenly anti-German utterances of the French bishops.

The Italian angle first. It had been arranged as early as the spring of 1873 that Victor Emmanuel should pay a state visit to Berlin in the fall, stopping off in Vienna first.[60] Bismarck felt that such a pair of visits would constitute a fresh gesture of defiance to the Pope. Austria was at the moment having difficulties with the Papacy over the abrogation of the Concordat of 1855; and a gesture of solidarity between Austria and the new anti-papal Italian Kingdom seemed to Bismarck an ideal way of striking at the Papacy.[61] A great demonstration was arranged in Vienna on September 20, three years to the day since the troops of Victor Emmanuel had entered Rome. Actually, neither Victor Emmanuel nor Francis Joseph expected much from the visit, and Austrian clerical-military circles were opposed to any reconciliation with Italy.[62] Andrassy, however, was anxious to solidify the Austro-German friendship, and worked to make a good impression on the Italian King.[63] That part of the Bismarckian policy appeared successful. Curiously enough, the visit of Victor Emmanuel to Berlin was less satisfactory to the Italian ruler. Both Bismarck and William I were determined to maintain their ecclesiastical policy and, while admitting that Italy could hardly go quite so far,

[59] Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 408-409; Despagnet, *op. cit.*, pp. 33-34.

[60] Goyau, *op. cit.*, II, 62-63.

[61] *Ibid.*, II, 64-65; Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 408-409.

[62] Wertheimer, *Andrassy*, II, 200; Goyau, *op. cit.*, II, 63-64.

[63] Wertheimer, *Andrassy*, II, 200-201; Wahl, *Vom Bismarck der 70er Jahre*, p. 56.

wanted a stepping-up of the tempo of the Italian anti-clerical measures; at the same time, the Germans promised that they would not allow any attack on Italy, but refused to conclude any written agreement.[64] Evidently Victor Emmanuel felt that the Italo-German combination would be too one-sided, or perhaps he felt that Bismarck simply did not understand the relations between the Vatican and the Italian Kingdom. At any rate, he reportedly returned from Berlin, "very much cooled off" toward Germany;[65] and it was an open secret in Europe that negotiations between the Vatican and the Quirinal were undertaken shortly afterward.

In October, 1873, William I and Bismarck visited Vienna, and conferences took place between the two Emperors, supported by Bismarck and Andrassy; and the solidarity of Austria and Germany was trumpeted abroad. Bismarck was at this time furious at the resistance of the Catholic Church in Germany, and he determined to subordinate to the Church conflict the entire policy of the Empire. He overplayed his hand in an effort to get Austria to launch a Kulturkampf of her own, and only succeeded in frightening Andrassy by violent outbursts against Pius IX, at whom he railed as "a peril for all countries and all thrones, a revolutionary, an anarchist, whom all Europe must oppose if a single prince is to be secure on his throne."[66] Andrassy felt that the struggle against the Church had become a monomania with Bismarck and that this frenzy itself exposed him to defeat.

Not only were Italy and Austria somewhat repelled by the violence of Bismarck's emotions; so also was Russia. The conclusion of the Three Emperors' Alliance in 1873 had been followed by some cessation of the anti-German sentiment in such sections of the

[64] Wahl, *op. cit.*, 56-57, 68-69; see particularly for the attitude of William I, an exchange of correspondence between the Emperor and Bismarck in *Anhang zu den Gedanken und Erinnerungen von Otto Fürst von Bismarck* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1901), I, 242-244. According to an article by M. de Blowitz in *London Times*, May 5, 1874, Bismarck offered the restoration of Nice and Savoy as the price for Italian help against France; see Despagnet, *op. cit.*, p. 34. But this fantastic tale was flatly denied in both Germany and Italy.

[65] Wahl, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

[66] Goyau, *op. cit.*, II, 65-66.

Russian press as the *Moscow Gazette* and *Golos*.[67] The Kulturkampf May Laws, too, occasioned an outburst of anti-Catholic articles in *Golos* and *Russky Mir*. But Gorchakov was in 1873 trying to stay on good terms with the Vatican;[68] and on several occasions, even after the conclusion of the Three Emperors' Alliance, Bismarck became dissatisfied with the Russian Foreign Minister's attitude on the Church question.[69] Thus Bismarck's efforts to enlist Italy, Austria, and Russia in a common war against the Catholic Church had not quite succeeded, and had even provoked a certain malaise in the minds of his new allies. Properly to understand this malaise, it is necessary to consider Bismarck's other policy—viz., his attempts to force the French government into measures against the French bishops.

On July 26, 1873,[70] Mgr. Foullon, Bishop of Nancy, wrote a pastoral letter directing the clergy of his diocese, which included part of Lorraine (the new delimitation of dioceses made necessary by the cession of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany, and provided for by the Treaty of Frankfort, not yet having been made operative), to pray for the return of the lost provinces to France.[71] At more or less the same time, certain Catholic bishops in Great Britain, in Belgium, and in Austria also assailed the clerical policy of Bismarck.[72] The letter of the Bishop of Nancy exasperated Bis-

[67] Wahl, *op. cit.*, 66.

[68] *Ibid.*, 65.

[69] Gontaut-Biron, *Mon Ambassade en Allemagne*, pp. 168 ff.; Wertheimer, *Andrassy*, II, 74. Bismarck was dissatisfied, too, with Oubril, the Russian Ambassador in Berlin, who was a Roman Catholic of French descent, and, worse than that, married to a Polish wife whom Bismarck accused of intriguing with the Center Party; Rupp, *A Wavering Friendship*, p. 59.

[70] This date is given correctly in Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 413, footnote; in Robert H. Wienefeld, *Franco-German Relations, 1878-1885*, in *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science*, XLVII (1929), #4, p. 20, and in *D.D.F.*, I, footnote to #244, p. 276, as July 26, 1873. It is incorrectly given in *G.P.*, I. #131, note, as August 3, 1873.

[71] For the text of the letter, see Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 413, footnote.

[72] André Dreux, *Dernières années de l'ambassade en Allemagne de M. de Gontaut-Biron, 1873-1877* (Paris, 1907), pp. 5-6; Goyau, *op. cit.*, II, ch. VII; see also *D.D.F.*, I, #264, p. 297.

marck;[73] but it was a month later, on the eve of the final evacuation of French territory (which added to French annoyance), that Bismarck demanded the French government take satisfactory measures to prevent a repetition of the offensive pastoral letter.[74] Broglie first tried to evade the issue by arguing that the government could not be held responsible for statements by the bishops;[75] but Bismarck refused to accept this declination of responsibility, demanding a public and official censure.[76] His own language was not too moderate,[77] and, finally, he demanded the prosecution of the Bishop of Nancy in a French court.[78] Broglie declared himself willing to have the Minister of Worship send a letter of censure to the Bishop of Nancy, but felt he could not go beyond that. When the bishop tried to get the French government to intervene on behalf of several priests in German Lorraine who had been cited to court for reading his letter, Broglie declined to do so and the Minister of Public Worship, M. de Fourtou, wrote the Bishop of Nancy that several points in his letter had offended the "just sensibilities of the German government."[79] Bismarck promptly declared that this demand showed how little impression the first circular of the Minister of Public Worship had made on the Bishop of Nancy and how much ground the German government had for demanding another method of procedure.[80] At this point, the negotiations came to a temporary halt, but were resumed a month later after a number of things had caused an increased bitterness of feeling. In France, the Broglie Ministry, which had come in in May, fell; but Broglie formed a new cabinet, in which, however, he gave up the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Duc de Decazes, a skilled diplomatic manipulator. In Germany, the elec-

[73] Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 413, footnote; Wienefeld, *loc. cit.*, p. 20.

[74] *G.P.*, I, #131, p. 211.

[75] *G.P.*, I, #132, pp. 211-212.

[76] *G.P.*, I, #133, p. 213.

[77] *G.P.*, I, #135, p. 216.

[78] *G.P.*, I, #137, p. 221.

[79] *G.P.*, I, #139, and footnote, pp. 224-225.

[80] *G.P.*, I, #140, p. 225.

tions of November, 1873, in Prussia saw the Center Party gain thirty-two additional seats; and those of January, 1874, found ninety-two seats in the Imperial Reichstag controlled by the Center Party instead of sixty-seven.[81] On November 21, 1873, Pius IX published an encyclical letter *Etsi multa luctuosa*, in which he deplored the recent misfortunes of the Church and of the Holy See, and painted in dark colors the situation of the Catholics in Italy and Germany. Shortly after, the bishops of the province of Bourges under the presidency of the Archbishop of Bourges addressed a letter of encouragement to the German bishops, thanking them for the example given by their attitude.[82] Mgr. Freppel, Bishop of Angers, protested in a pastoral letter against the situation in Prussia where

> the religious orders are pursued and hunted down without truce or mercy . . . bishops are deprived of the most essential power, that of naming pastors of souls . . . functionaries arrogate to themselves the right of regulating the education of the clergy, and as if to add insult to injury, a small sect (the Old Catholics) are fostered by the State.[83]

Mgr. Plantier, Archbishop of Nimes, fulminated against both the Italian and the German governments; he wrote of the "hatred of Pontiff-Caesars for all true prelates and ecclesiastics", spoke of the "hideous voracity with which Italy had just seized the patrimony of the Church and its religious establishments", and traced the history of the House of Hohenzollern "from the larceny of Albert of Brandenburg at the expense of the Teutonic Order" to the "Germany of Bismarck which has preferred to continue that tradition of baseness and immorality."[84]

The imprudence of this language was recognized even by Broglie and Decazes;[85] and in an effort to ward off the probable Bismarck-

[81] Carroll, *Germany and the Great Powers*, p. 105.

[82] *D.D.F.*, I, footnote to #248, p. 282.

[83] *D.D.F.*, I, footnote 1 to #245, p. 287.

[84] *D.D.F.*, I, note 1 to #254, p. 291; Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 423; Dreux, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-6; Despagnet, *op. cit.*, p. 39; Lécanuet, *op. cit.*, I, 171, footnote 1.

[85] Broglie wrote to an associate, "One can see that they (the bishops) do not have to bear the brunt of the day." Broglie, *La Mission de M. Gontaut-Biron*, p. 159.

ian protests, they assumed the initiative. A Confidential Circular was addressed to the bishops of France by M. de Fourtou, the Minister of Public Worship, December 26, 1873, reminding the bishops that "there are between states certain mutual courtesies which cannot be forgotten; we must profess the same respect for other established powers which we claim for our own government."[86] The French government hoped this would satisfy the German government. But the hope was not realized. Bismarck and Bülow carried on a lengthy and acrimonious negotiation with Gontaut-Biron well into February, 1874. The French Ambassador tried to minimize the pastoral letters as merely religious documents;[87] but Bismarck insisted that "the attacks which come from France have an exceptional gravity because . . . they constitute an encouragement to those forms of resistance which we desire to overcome at all costs."[88] Bismarck felt that something beyond the Fourtou Circular was required, and demanded either that the French government take action at least against the Bishop of Nimes under an old law giving lay courts jurisdiction over ecclesiastics for "abuse of functions" (l'appel comme d'abus), or that the German Government be allowed to prosecute him directly in the French courts under a French Law of 1819 according to which a foreign sovereign might bring direct suit in French courts in case of an offense against his person.[89] The French government pointed out that these procedures had long been in disuse, and recourse to them might be both dangerous and futile.[90] Bismarck refused to be content with the Fourtou Circular, and several times during the negotiations used threatening language.

[86] The text of the Confidential Circular is in *D.D.F.*, I, Annexe to #257, pp. 292-293.

[87] *G.P.*, I, #141, 225-227; Dreux, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-17.

[88] Goyau, *op. cit.*, II, 106-107; Broglie, *op. cit.*, pp. 148-149; Dreux, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-18.

[89] For an explanation of the procedure "appel comme d'abus" and of the Ordinance of 1819, see *D.D.F.*, I, p. 296, footnote; *G.P.*, I, #141, pp. 225-227; Broglie, *op. cit.*, p. 149, footnote; p. 152-154; Dreux, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-17.

[90] *G.P.*, I, #142, pp. 227-230.

> In the state of our internal affairs, this is for us a political question of first rank. . . . I am determined to conquer in the conflict in which I am engaged against the Catholic Church. . . . Thus for the future of our relations you have great interest in calming the sentiment in France over foreign religious questions. Take care lest the masses become fanaticized in the name of the persecuted Catholic religion, for then the clerical party will leap into power, will espouse all the quarrels of the Roman Curia and you will inevitably be drawn into war with us. We cannot allow ourselves to be taken unawares by your attack. In that case it would be preferable to fight in two years, in one year, rather than to wait until you have completed your preparations.[91]

The French government, trying hard to placate Bismarck, was suddenly alarmed afresh by a new pastoral letter of the Bishop of Perigeux denouncing "the acts of Caesarism which rage in several regions of the New World and in our ancient Europe, with an unprecedented violence in Switzerland and in Germany."[92] In view of the delicate state of Franco-German relations, the French government feared this was "nothing less than a challenge flung in Bismarck's face."[93] The fact that the pastoral had been reprinted in the clerical paper *L'Univers* gave Decazes a chance to take a clever line. January 19, 1874, he announced the suspension of the paper for two months for having published a document which might "create diplomatic complications."[94] The following day, Decazes made a speech in the French Chamber; while promising respect for the spiritual authority, dignity, and independence of the Pope, he bespoke peace in Europe, and declared for amicable relations with Italy. "In order to secure peace, we will work without ceasing for the end of misunderstandings, the prevention of all conflicts; and

[91] The longest account of this January 13 conversation between Bismarck and Gontaut-Biron, is in Dreux, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-26; *D.D.F.*, I, #263, pp. 296-297, prints only a short account; an unsatisfactory version is in Broglie, *op. cit.*, pp. 148-151. There is nothing in *G.P.* See also, Pearl Boring Mitchell, *The Bismarckian Policy of Conciliation with France, 1875-1885* (Philadelphia, 1935), pp. 16-17.

[92] Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 427.

[93] Broglie, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

[94] Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 427-428; Broglie, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

we will also defend it against regrettable agitations, whatever their origin." [95]

The suspension of *L'Univers* and Decazes' speech, as a matter of fact, gave Bismarck the opportunity to beat a graceful retreat. The French Ambassador had previously suspected that Bismarck had been dragging things out in order to influence the Reichstag election and to get the new Army Bill passed.[96] If this were true, certainly the aim had not been realized, for in elections to the Reichstag, January 10, 1874, the Center Party had increased its strength and the government majority for the new Army Bill was jeopardized.[97] Bismarck's irritation at this outcome of the elections was reflected in his relations with Gontaut. But by the time the Army Bill was introduced, February 16, 1874, Bismarck had changed his tone. There is another explanation of Bismarck's retreat—the reaction of the various powers to this first " international Kulturkampf." Not only did the Powers fail to follow Bismarck's lead; under the skillful manipulation of the Duc de Decazes, the " international alignment which he had worked out in the preceding year began to disintegrate rapidly." [98]

Possibly egged on by the complaints of the French government that the Germans were protesting against the activity of the French bishops but not against those of certain Catholic bishops in Austria, Belgium, Italy and England,[99] Berlin reportedly sent vigorous complaints to the Austrian, the Belgian, and the Italian governments regarding the pastoral letters of their bishops on the clerical problem in Germany.[100] It is not entirely certain that such a note was sent to Vienna,[101] but Bismarck's whole attitude gave the

[95] *D.D.F.*, I, footnote to #270, p. 302; Broglie, *op. cit.*, pp. 162-163.

[96] *D.D.F.*, I, #264, p. 297; #272, p. 303.

[97] On this point see Carroll, *Germany and the Great Powers*, p. 105.

[98] Langer, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

[99] See *G.P.*, I, #141, pp. 225-227; Dreux, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-18; *D.D.F.*, I, #263, pp. 296-297; #264, p. 297; #265, pp. 298-299.

[100] The French chargé in Berlin reported that Radowitz told him this, January 26, 1874; *D.D.F.*, I, #275, p. 306.

[101] The French Ambassador in Vienna affirms it in *D.D.F.*, I, #277, p. 307; but later suggests that the Emperor of Austria denied that such a note was

French government a perfect opportunity to sow distrust of Germany in Austrian circles. The Austrian Minister of Worship told the French Ambassador that "Austria will never follow Germany along this road".[102] The French Ambassador told the Austrian Emperor that "Bismarck threatens us with war if we do not join him to destroy the Vatican, i. e., Catholicism, and that we cannot do, whatever danger threatens us. The Chancellor talks of winning to his cause other Powers which have Catholic subjects." Francis Joseph replied: "Bismarck is on the wrong track. He will succumb. . . . I will not follow him on that road."[103] Andrassy, sympathetic to Germany though he was, felt the whole Kulturkampf to be basically ill-conceived;[104] he told the French Ambassador in St. Petersburg (where he and the Emperor were on a visit) that Bismarck "has lost his sang froid and is out of his senses," and added: "We pray that France may soon take again the rank in the world that is due her; a strong France is more necessary than ever in the equilibrium of Europe."[105] Later, after Bismarck's retreat in the bishops' case, Andrassy remarked sarcastically that "they have mixed water in their wine."[106]

The Italian Government took no action in reply to the German complaint regarding the utterances of the Italian bishops.[107] With Russia, the other member of the Three Emperors' Agreement of 1873, Decazes was successful also in undermining Bismarck. The Tsar had a conversation with General Le Flo, the French Ambassador at St. Petersburg, January 28, 1874, in which the Tsar tried to calm Le Flo by referring to the excitement over the pastoral letters of the French Bishops as "a ruse of Prince Bismarck's . . . a means of turning away attention from embarrassments at

sent, although he is not too sure, because "he spoke in a very low voice." *D.D.F.*, I, #282, pp. 311-312.

[102] *D.D.F.*, I, #277, p. 307.

[103] *D.D.F.*, I, #282, pp. 311-312.

[104] Wertheimer, *Andrassy*, II, 220.

[105] *D.D.F.*, I, #284, p. 313.

[106] *D.D.F.*, I, #291, p. 317.

[107] Wahl, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

home." [108] A few days later, the Tsar repeated his assurances to Le Flo, and talked of the "subterfuge of Bismarck." [109] A few weeks after that, Gontaut-Biron was in St. Petersburg for a time, and the Tsar said to him, "It would be monstrous to make war on you on such pretexts." [110] Gorchakov as well as the Tsar reassured the French diplomats, saying to Le Flo, "He [Bismarck] wished to drag us into his unfortunate religious campaign, but we formally declared to him that we would not join him. . . ." [111] He remarked also to Gontaut-Biron that Bismarck would not make war on France if the moral weight of Europe were against him, as it would be at the moment.[112] Prince Orloff, the Russian Ambassador in Paris, referred to Bismarck's "passionate determination to look upon every question from the point of view of clericalism, which has become his exclusive and almost morbid preoccupation." [113]

There can be no doubt that Bismarck's policy had made a bad impression in Russia, and had caused a reaction in favor of France.[114] Not that the Russians were particularly concerned about the susceptibilities of the Catholic Church, for the truce of 1872 was about to be ruptured again.[115] But Russia, from a purely political point of view, could not see France further reduced. Russia and Austria had drawn closer together, and as the French Ambassador in St. Petersburg put it, "Germany has gained nothing by this rapprochement . . . while France has won lively sympathy . . . ." [116]

Not only had Bismarck lost ground with his nearer neighbors; he had lost it also with England. Late in December, 1873, Bismarck in a conversation with Odo Russell, the British Ambassador

[108] *D.D.F.*, I, #278, pp. 308-309; Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 435-436.

[109] *D.D.F.*, I, #283, p. 312.

[110] Dreux, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-46.

[111] Broglie, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

[112] Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 436-437.

[113] Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, III, 74-76.

[114] *D.D.F.*, I, #278, pp. 308-309; Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 436-437.

[115] Wahl, *op. cit.*, 59-60.

[116] Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 436-437.

in Berlin, who was very sympathetic to Germany, used language calculated to alarm even that diplomatic Pollyanna. To Russell's statement that the weakened state of France precluded every excuse for war, Bismarck said that France's power of making war depended on the alliances she would be able to contract, that he himself could not be sure of his alliances, " because alliances sometimes depend on the lives of single individuals ", and concluded by saying that " an excuse for war was easily found." Russell told him that Germany would lose the sympathies of all the world if she rushed into an unjust and unnecessary war." [117] Doubtless Russell's account of this conversation (although he tried to minimize it), combined with a note from Lord Lyons, the British Ambassador in Paris, caused some alarm in London. Lyons wrote to Granville, January 17, 1874:

> It is difficult to persecute any religion in these days, but it is impossible for the French government to set itself in violent opposition to the predominant religion in France. I do not know what means we have of getting pacific and moderating counsels listened to at Berlin but I do not think the weakness of France sufficient safeguard to other countries against the perils of the present state of things to the peace of Europe. It may be very easy to bully and crush France, but will it be possible to do this without raising a storm in other countries? [118]

Therefore when Decazes gently suggested to Lord Granville that a few words from Odo Russell might help preserve calm in Berlin, Granville (although without giving a direct reply to Decazes) instructed Russell to tell Bülow in confidence that Britain " believed France was acting in good faith in her endeavors to free herself from her former Roman policy and hoped the German government would do all they could to assist her." [119] The German reply was

[117] Russell to Granville, December 22, 1873, quoted in Winifred Taffs, *Ambassador to Bismarck: Lord Odo Russell, First Baron Ampthill* (London, 1938), pp. 65-66; Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, III, 74-76 quotes (without giving any source) a letter from Decazes to a friend giving another account of this conversation, more lurid and quite inaccurate.

[118] Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II, 50-51.

[119] F. O. 244, 276, #24, Granville to Russell, January 23, 1874; Taffs, *Russell*, pp. 67-68.

conciliatory. Russell was assured that Germany "in the interests of peace only" intended "a friendly and timely warning" to France of the danger of ultramontane intrigues.[120] At precisely this time, Bismarck began to alter his tone toward the French Ambassador. His speech at the opening of the Reichstag on February 5 was disarming; he even expressed to Gontaut-Biron on the following day the hope that the French were pleased by the speech; and the German Ambassador in Paris was ordered, on February 10, to drop the matter for the time being.[121] In the meantime, Queen Victoria, perturbed by the growing uneasiness of even the Germanophile Russell,[122] took the step of addressing a letter to Emperor William, declaring that in spite of the fact that England was "essentially Protestant", if Germany should "avail herself of her greatly superior force to crush or annihilate a beaten foe and thus to engender the belief that a strong and united Germany was not after all the reputed mainstay of European peace", "this might lead to lamentable consequences".[123] Emperor William in reply tried to justify the recent demands of his government, declaring that the Legitimists in France were "trying to reach the throne by fostering the cry of revenge," that Germany could not "in the interests of peace" overlook these manifestations, and that she had merely tried to point out that "the daily expressions of these feelings of revenge must compromise the prospects of peace." Finally, appealing to the Protestant sympathies of Victoria, he declared:

> The contest in which we are engaged with Catholicism gives France the opportunity of letting loose and encouraging hatred against Germany and combatting Protestantism just as the priests of Germany are doing. We do not perceive this movement opposed in France. . . . .[124]

[120] Taffs, *Russell*, p. 68.

[121] *D.D.F.*, I, #281, pp. 311-312; *G.P.*, I, #150, p. 238.

[122] Taffs, *Russell*, p. 68.

[123] *Letters of Queen Victoria*, Second Series, 1862-1878, II, 313-314 (Hereafter referred to simply as *Letters of Victoria*, II).

[124] *Letters of Victoria*, II, 325-326.

But the net effect on the British diplomats was to leave them filled with misgivings. Russell summed up his impressions, February 20, 1874, in a letter to his colleague, Lord Lyons, in Paris:

> In Bismarck's opinion, France, to avoid a conflict with him should gag her press, imprison her Bishops, quarrel with Rome, refrain from making an army or seeking alliances with other powers—all out of deference to Germany. . . . His anti-Roman policy will serve him to pick a quarrel with any power he pleases by declaring that he has discovered an anti-German conspiracy among the clergy of the country he wishes to fight.[125]

It is clear from all this that the "first international Kulturkampf" had proved a boomerang. Partly through the skillful maneuvering of Decazes, Bismarck's efforts to use the religious question as a political, diplomatic weapon had opened a rift among the members of the Three Emperors' League, estranged Italy, and aroused suspicion in England. Even inside Germany, observers had not failed to make acid comments on his policy. Hans Blum wrote in *Die Grenzboten:* "The lack of esteem we now suffer from in Europe comes from the fact that everywhere in Europe Germany has carried on a fight . . . against the Roman hierarchy."[126] Koenneritz, the Saxon Minister to Bavaria, declared to the French Chargé at Munich: "What Bismarck would like is that, in all countries, the Catholic clergy should be annihilated and precipitated to the bottom of the ocean."[127]

Bismarck was unable to get other governments to help him annihilate the Catholic clergy. But the next months saw an intensification of the German Kulturkampf. In March, 1874, a law was passed providing for the administration of vacated parishes and dioceses whose priests or bishops had been removed by the government (and for whom the Church refused to appoint successors, on the ground that their offices were not vacant). In May, 1874, new

[125] Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II, 52-53.

[126] Goyau, *op. cit.*, II, 111-112.

[127] Dawson, *op. cit.*, I, 441-448; Spahn, in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, VIII, 708; Hanotaux, *op. cit.*, II, 424.

legislation provided that all priests removed from their offices under the May Laws of 1873 might be arrested, deprived of citizenship, and even expelled from the Empire. Archbishop Ledochowski of Posen was deprived of his see and condemned to two years' imprisonment; and soon all the Prussian sees were vacant, as were many of the parishes.[127a] These matters, with the opposition to the Army Bill, and especially the celebrated Arnim Trial, centered attention on home affairs.[128]

Abroad, Bismarck began to work to heal some of the wounds caused by the "first international Kulturkampf." Von Arnim, whom Bismarck had long wanted to replace, was now supplanted by Prince Chlodwig zu Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst. Bismarck no longer had so much fear of the MacMahon régime, which he considered incompetent and scarcely able to contract alliances.[120] Hohenlohe, therefore, was to work for good relations with the Republic, which although "a bad example for monarchical Europe" still was "less dangerous than the monarchy which would foster all sorts of trouble abroad."[130] Bismarck could not get rid of the worry that a "clerical restoration of the monarchy . . . would have wide support in Catholic Europe" and might seem "a useful point of support to any leader of Austrian policy."[131] [This of course did not include Andrassy.]

As a matter of fact while the French felt that the "blow prepared against them had been for the moment parried,"[132] the Duc de Decazes was shrewd enough to keep the suspicions of Bismarck's intentions alive. Late in March, 1874, he urged the Powers not to be too sure that Bismarck's pretensions might not break out again

[127a] *Ibid.*

[128] Wienefeld, *loc. cit.*, p. 23.

[129] See Bismarck's letter to Prince Henry of Reuss, German Ambassador to St. Petersburg, *G.P.*, I, #151, p. 239.

[130] Hohenlohe, *Memoirs*, II, 98-99; 109.

[131] *G.P.*, I, #151, p. 239.

[132] The phrase was used by Andrassy to the French Consul at Pesth; *D.D.F.*, I, #295, p. 323.

in a more extravagant form.[133] Bismarck was probably aware of Decazes' activities,[134] and his humor did not improve as the summer of 1874 passed in a state of uneasy irritation. The French press worked itself up into a state of "incessant buzzing and stinging."[135] Finally William I, at the opening of the autumn session of the Reichstag, made a speech which Odo Russell felt calculated to "cause irritation in Russia and exasperation all over the Catholic world." Russell reported that some people in Berlin thought Bismarck was trying "to frighten France and keep Europe in hot water."[136] At any rate, the French, the Russian, and even the British statesmen were disquieted. The new Disraeli government was already suspicious of Bismarck and distrustful of the Three Emperors' League, and Russell's report added to its suspicions.[137]

Bismarck was also plagued by Spanish problems in the summer of 1874. The members of the Three Emperors' League had hitherto preserved an attitude of hands off in regard to the domestic difficulties in Spain. In August, 1874, however, the German government proposed official recognition of the anti-clerical Marshal Serrano as a means of striking a blow at Ultramontanism. Andrassy suggested merely recognizing Serrano as the "Executive Power" without opening formal diplomatic relations with him; but Russia refused to follow the lead of her two associates. The Tsar preferred not to give any support to a republican régime. And Gorchakov, although Russia was again in 1874 on bad terms with the Papacy, was suspicious of the anti-Catholic tone of Serrano. A rift appeared again in the Three Emperors' League. And finally Bismarck agreed to support Alfonso, a way out agreeable to both Austria and Russia.[138] But the bonds holding the League together were being severely strained.

[133] *D.D.F.*, I, #295, p. 322.

[134] Carroll, *Germany and the Great Powers*, p. 108.

[135] *London Times*, October 28, 1874.

[136] Taffs, *Russell*, pp. 71-73.

[137] Langer, *Alliances*, pp. 41-42.

[138] Hajo Holborn, *Bismarck's europäische Politik zu Beginn der siebziger Jahre und die Mission Radowitz* (Berlin, 1925), pp. 53-54.

At the same time, in these months, Franco-Italian relations improved. The recall of the gunboat *Orenoque* from Rome by the French government removed one of the last sources of antagonism between the two States.[139] And, be it recalled, the Franco-Italian antagonism was one element that bound Italy to the coat-tails of Bismarck. This latest development, therefore, added to his irritation. Neither France nor Italy was much pleased by Bismarck's suppression of the German Embassy at the Holy See;[140] and Russia, on the point of a fresh reconciliation with the Vatican, saw another example of divergent policies from those of Bismarck.[141]

Thus by the start of 1875, although the international situation was outwardly quiet, Bismarck was really far from happy. The internal Kulturkampf was not going well; and Bismarck was in a state of constant irritation.[142] Besides, Russia's evident tendency to play her own game, outside the Three Emperors' League, conjured up again the "nightmare of coalitions." Fearful of the Catholic groups in Belgium, France, Italy, and, to a lesser extent, Austria,[143] Bismarck dreaded "an understanding between Russia, France, and Austria which would isolate Germany and unite her ultramontane enemies."[144] Gorchakov was dinning into the ears of receptive French diplomats the dicta: "A strong, powerful France is necessary to Europe", and "I can only say one thing, be strong, be strong."[145] Decazes was biding his time, waiting to test

[139] Despagnet, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

[140] Jean Lulves, "Bismarck und die römische Frage," in *Deutsche Revue*, XLI (June, 1916), 292-293.

[141] Wahl, *Vom Bismarck der 70er Jahre*, p. 66.

[142] Langer, *op. cit.*, p. 43; Carroll, *French Public Opinion*, p. 53; Holborn, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

[143] As long as Andrassy was in power, Bismarck did not fear Austrian defection: but Schweinitz reported from Vienna a move to oust Andrassy; Johannes Ziekursch, *Politische Geschichte der neuen deutschen Kaiserreiches* (3 vol. umes, Frankfort, 1927), II, 34-41.

[144] Russell to Derby, February 3, 1875, quoted by Winifred Taffs, "The War Scare of 1875," in *Slavonic Review*, IX (December, 1930), 336.

[145] *D.D.F.*, I, #343, p. 364; #354, pp. 370-371.

the value of Gorchakov's exhortation,[146] waiting for Bismarck to resume his "comedy of errors" against the Catholic Church. He had not long to wait. The "second international Kulturkampf" was about to begin.

An encyclical of Pius IX, February 5, 1875, proclaiming the May Laws invalid (*irritas*) and inflicting excommunication on those priests installed by the government, constituted for Bismarck a definitive declaration of war.[147] He was promptly galvanized into action in several quarters.

In December, 1874, the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* had printed an article, with supporting evidence, on a plot concocted by a certain Belgian worker named Duchesne, who had written a letter to the Archbishop of Paris, offering to assassinate Bismarck and thus avenge France and the Church for 60,000 francs.[148] The caliber of Duchesne may be judged by the fact that the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* later printed a story that Duchesne had with engaging impartiality written also to Bismarck offering "to kill, if Bismarck wanted, the bishops, the archbishops and the pope himself."[149] The Archbishop had promptly communicated with the Surété Générale of Belgium, which put Duchesne under surveillance.[150] And there the affair rested for almost a month, until Bismarck, on February 4, 1875, launched his new "international Kulturkampf" by a stiff note to the Belgian government. In it he complained that on several occasions, episcopal letters, articles in the Belgian press, and finally an address to the Bishop of Paderborn by the Belgian Catholics, had, by strong condemnation of Bismarck's clerical policy, caused an increase of difficulties for the German administration; the Belgian Government had maintained

[146] This statement is made by Langer, *op. cit.*, p. 43, basing it on some unpublished material in Hauser, *Histoire diplomatique de l'Europe*, I, 103.

[147] Jean Lulves, "Bismarck und die römische Frage," *Hochland*, XXVI, Band 2 (June, 1929), 272-273.

[148] The account here is based on that in *D.D.F.*, I, #'s 348 to 392, pp. 367-409; Taffs, "The War Scare of 1875," in *Slavonic Review*, IX (December, 1930), 335-349; (March, 1931), 632-649; Taffs, *Russell*, pp. 83-91.

[149] *D.D.F.*, I, #378, p. 394; Taffs, *loc. cit.*, 339.

[150] *D.D.F.*, I, #348, p. 367.

that Belgian laws afforded no means of preventing or punishing such actions; the Duchesne affair had elicited a similar response; the German Government, therefore, asked that the Belgian Government revise its legislation to secure greater protection for foreigners, so that violent attacks upon a neighboring State would prove impossible.[151] It must be conceded that the conduct of the Belgian Government was scarcely above reproach. It admittedly held up its answer purposely as long as possible,[150] until February 27, so that the reply did not actually reach Berlin until March 2. The Belgian government denied culpability on all three counts — the episcopal letters, the address of the Belgian Catholics to the Bishop of Paderborn, and the Duchesne affair—and declared that it was impossible to make any changes in the existing Belgian laws.[152] In the meantime, Bismarck, involved in his new campaign elsewhere,[153] and getting no reply from Brussels, evidently decided to "warn other governments of the danger to which the language of their clergy and press might expose them."[154] Consequently, before receiving the Belgian reply, he acquainted Decazes, through Hohenlohe, of the German note of February 5, and gave Decazes permission to bring it to the attention of the other Powers.[155] This gave Decazes the chance he had been waiting for. He chose to regard it not as an isolated incident, but as a symptom of a general German plan against the Catholic powers.[156] The celebrated German order of March 2, 1875, prohibiting the export of horses from Germany, strengthened him in this idea.[157] He jumped to the conclusion, without any evidence, that a demand similar to that made on Belgium had also been made by Germany on the Italian government. Although his own representatives repeatedly informed him

[151] *D.D.F.*, I, #355, pp. 371-372.

[152] *D.D.F.*, I, #356, pp. 372-374.

[153] See below.

[154] This was the opinion of Odo Russell; Taffs, *loc. cit.*, p. 339.

[155] *D.D.F.*, I, #355, pp. 371-372.

[156] *D.D.F.*, I, #359, p. 375; #362, pp. 376-377; #370, pp. 383-384.

[157] The text of the order is in *G.P.*, I, #156, pp. 245-246.

that no such formal demand had been made in Italy, he persisted in believing it,[158] and proceeded to mobilize European opinion against Germany and on the side of beleaguered Belgium, and, as he thought, soon to be beleaguered France. Lord Derby in London, while approving the resistance of Belgium, counseled prudence and circumspection on the Belgians,[159] and suggested that France "restrain rather than excite the Belgians."[160] But Decazes saw events connected with a "complete system of political action in the application of which it is difficult to see how far Germany . . . may go in the future."[160a] To St. Petersburg he wrote in a similar vein adding that if Germany pursued her scheme "with the perseverance and energy which usually characterizes her policy it cannot fail to have serious consequences."[161] Learning from Harcourt at Vienna that "the Germans were placing orders for cartridges and shells", and that some Austrian military men felt Germany "would be militarily prepared by the end of June",[162] Decazes promptly fired the news off to the French embassies in London, Vienna, St. Petersburg, and Berlin, declaring that the fear of a German coup "casts over Europe a shadow it would be puerile to ignore", and that while "France had no desire to exaggerate the peril, it was difficult to avoid some emotion in the presence of the multiplication of evidence that combines to show us that Prussia is increasing her military preparations and hastening to complete her armaments by the end of June."[163] Decazes even asked the Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Antonelli, to counsel the French Bishops to circumspection and prudence, since "any manifestation coming from our

[158] See the despatches from the French representatives indicating that Decazes had jumped at a false conclusion on the matter of a démarche to Italy; *D.D.F.*, I, #359, p. 375; #361, p. 376; #362, pp. 376-377; #363 and footnote 1, pp. 378-379; #367, p. 381; #369, pp. 382-383; #375, pp. 390-391.

[159] *D.D.F.*, I, #357, p. 374.

[160] *D.D.F.*, I, #362, pp. 376-377.

[160a] *Ibid.*

[161] *D.D.F.*, I, #370, pp. 383-384.

[162] *D.D.F.*, I, #374, p. 389; Langer, *Alliances*, p. 46.

[163] *D.D.F.*, I, #375, pp. 390-391.

Bishops, susceptible of being considered as support to the German Bishops would be eminently dangerous."[164] Decazes was doing his best to throw Europe into a bad case of nerves. That he achieved some success cannot be doubted. At just this juncture, April 8, 1875, came the "War in Sight" article of the *Berlin Post* and the subsequent so-called "War Scare" of 1875, which threw Europe into a turmoil. It is not within the province of this article to discuss the war scare in any detail.[165] Some historians have tended to lay the blame for the atmosphere which precipitated the war scare almost entirely at the door of Decazes.[166] But it ought to be noticed that without the Bismarckian "international Kulturkampfs"—in 1874 and now again in 1875—the atmosphere would not have been favorable to Decazes' machinations. For it was not only in Belgium that Bismarck had been pursuing his second campaign.

Following the papal encyclical of February 5, he had determined to charge the Italian Cabinet with responsibility for the incitements to resistance contained in the Encyclical.[167] Decazes was not correct in assuming that Bismarck had made a formal démarche at Rome; but the German Ambassador was instructed to point out informally to Visconti-Venosta that Germany could no longer tolerate threats from the Pope, and that the Italian government could best curb the Pope by modifying the Law of Guarantees under whose protection the Pope was attacking foreign states with impunity.[168] Visconti-Venosta said he thought the kind of pressure demanded by Bismarck would violate both the Catholic sentiment of the Italian nation and the Law of Guarantees,[169] but promised

[164] *D.D.F.*, I, #369, pp. 382-383.

[165] The War Scare of 1875 may be followed in Langer, *Alliances*, pp. 31-55; Taffs, "The War Scare of 1875," in *Slavonic Review*, IX (December, 1930), 335-349; (March, 1931), 632-649; Carroll, *Germany and the Great Powers*, pp. 112-117.

[166] Langer, *op. cit.*, 45-55.

[167] Lulves, "Bismarck und die römische Frage," *Hochland*, June, 1929, 272-273; and in *Deutsche Revue*, June, 1916, 293; Halperin, *op. cit.*, pp. 381-383.

[168] Halperin, *Italy and the Vatican*, pp. 380-381; Dreux, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

[169] Halperin, *op. cit.*, 381-382; Bernhard von Bülow, *Memoirs of Prince von Bülow* (English edition, 4 volumes, Boston, 1929-1932), IV, 339-340.

to bring the matter to the attention of Minghetti and the King. The matter stopped there. Bismarck, exasperated by the Italian refusal, accused the Italian Government of flirting with the Vatican behind Germany's back instead of supporting the German fight against Rome. In a moment of ill-humor, he remarked, "We have become absolutely indifferent to the Italians." [170]

That was a bit of an exaggeration. He was not at all indifferent to Italy. In fact, he was deeply perturbed at the prospect of an Italo-Austrian-French alignment against Germany. Austria, like Italy, had shown no inclination to follow the German lead. A prospective meeting between Francis Joseph and Victor Emmanuel, April 5-7, 1875, just before the "War in Sight" article, filled Bismarck with misgivings of the worst sort. There were even reports that a Catholic league of Austria, France, and Italy was actually in existence.[171] And, Bismarck, annoyed at the ill-success of his Kulturkampf inside Germany, feared this Catholic league might band together under papal leadership against the German Empire.[172] All around him, the diplomatic structure he had created was tottering.

The Russian government had actually opened negotiations with the Vatican, and had concluded, March 2, 1875, the very day on which the reply of the Belgian government was made, a provisional agreement dealing with some of the outstanding differences, including the problem of the bishops of Poland.[173] No wonder that Bismarck was reported to be in a state of chronic ill-humor, poor health, and nerves.[174] Even the normally sympathetic Odo Russell

[170] Lulves, "Bismarck und die römische Frage," *Deutsche Revue*, June, 1916, 295; cf. Halperin, *op. cit.*, pp. 381-383; Wertheimer, *Andrassy*, II, 220; Hohenlohe, *Memoirs*, II, 152.

[171] Halperin, *op. cit.*, p. 384.

[172] Ziekursch, *Politische Geschichte*, II, 39-41.

[173] Wahl, *Vom Bismarck der 70er Jahre*, p. 66.

[174] One member of the Russian Foreign Office tartly remarked, "I do not know that the nervous or bilious state of a public official ought to be regarded today as a diplomatic argument." *D.D.F.*, I, #396, p. 421.

wrote to his government that Bismarck "is realizing that his struggle with the Papacy must be a single-handed one, and he is alarmed to find that other governments . . . do not obey his call and follow his example of imprisoning Bishops, banishing Jesuits and suppressing convents. . . ."[175] The London *Times*, always close to official opinion, recommended some arrangement by the Belgian Government on the Duchesne affair as desirable, but denied that the expression of sentiments of sympathy for a church, a cause, a party, an association could be classed in that category of international events which a government is obliged to suppress in its territory.[176] The *Economist* flatly denounced a policy based only on force, and stated that Bismarck had come to see an enemy everywhere that a free idea remained: "Europe will have no peace until the day that Germany renounces her senseless and desperate crusade against a Church that is impregnable."[176] With this type of article coming from the English press, never inclined to be strongly pro-Catholic, it can scarcely be surprising that Bismarck gradually beat a more or less graceful retreat on the Belgian question. In a second note, April 17, 1875, Bismarck expressed regret that Belgium could not see her way to amending her legal code, but hoped that she would appreciate that this was an unsatisfactory state of affairs, and that she would eventually be able to rectify it.[177] By that time the War Scare of 1875 was in full swing, and the whole religious problem was temporarily eclipsed by that spectacular display of diplomatic pyrotechnics. As has been said before, it is not within the province of this article to discuss the war scare. But this much might be said as a sort of conclusion to this discussion.

It is entirely probable that Bismarck, in April, 1875, had no serious intention of making war on France. But he had for several years been setting Europe by the ears in an effort to line up international support for his struggle against the Catholic Church; he had, by that policy, blustered and threatened and created suspicions

[175] Taffs, *Russell*, pp. 79-82.

[176] *D.D.F.*, I, #380, pp. 397-398.

[177] Taffs, *Russell*, p. 84, cites the Bismarckian note; see also, a conversation between Gontaut-Biron and Bülow, *D.D.F.*, I, #392, pp. 407-409.

of his ultimate political intentions. Decazes, in the spring of 1875, had exploited this situation by attributing to Bismarck sinister designs in which he himself perhaps did not fully believe, but which, in view of Bismarck's first "international Kulturkampf" of 1873-1874, and his second, of February, 1875, no one felt entirely safe in disregarding. There is little reason to deny that the War Scare of 1875 was a serious diplomatic set back for Bismarck, and that, after it, his whole international alignment had to be rebuilt. The Three Emperors' League was only a polite fiction: Italy was drifting away from Germany; England was estranged and suspicious. But the War Scare of 1875, and Decazes' exploitation of it were made possible in the two years before 1875, by Bismarck's reckless prosecution of his struggle against the Catholic Church. "There is no question but that the Kulturkampf, at first the servant of Bismarckian foreign policy, had now become its master." [178]

FRANCIS A. ARLINGHAUS

University of Detroit

[178] Wahl, *Vom Bismarck der 70er Jahre*, p. 67.

MISCELLANY

I

Brownson's Ontologism

One of the principal points of argument between the admirers of Orestes A. Brownson and his critics is his ontologism. The recent life of Brownson by Doran Whalen[1] and the subsequent reviews and articles have again brought the question forward. The historical interest in the question is not whether Brownson held the scholastic theory on the knowledge of the Supreme Being, but just exactly what Brownson actually held. After the condemnation of certain kinds of ontologism in 1861 by the Sacred Congregation, those who had been accused of ontologism in this country were quite anxious to free themselves of the charge. Brownson defended himself publicly against criticism appearing in the *Catholic World*[2] in an article in his own *Review* in July, 1874,[3] to the satisfaction of his friends but not of all his critics. In that article he refers to a letter he had written in 1862 to a professor at Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg defending his position. The professor was the Reverend Henry S. McMurdie. Father McMurdie's letter is in the Brownson Collection in the Archives of the University of Notre Dame. The answer was found in the Archives of Mt. St. Mary's College through the kindness of Father Hugh J. Phillips. The letters were written within a year after the condemnation of certain propositions of the ontologists and are as follows:

Mount St. Mary's College—
1st May, 1862.

Dear Sir,

Although I had the pleasure of an introduction to you during your last visit to the College, I can hardly presume that I am known to you even by name. Our catalogue will however serve as Master of Ceremonies, & inform you that since I have been a Priest I have been employed here in teaching either Metaphysics or Theology, or, as at present, both. My

[1] Doran Whalen, *Granite for God's House. The Life of Orestes Augustus Brownson* (New York, 1941).

[2] "F. Louage's Philosophy", *Catholic World*, XIX (1874), 231-46.

[3] "Ontologism and Psychologism", *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, II (Last Series, July, 1874), 357-376.

object in troubling you at present is to ask your opinion on the propositions of which I annex a copy.[4] I dare say you may have heard of the affair before & can perhaps give me more information on the subject than I am at present in possession of. I send them as they reached me through a former pupil who is now finishing his theological studies at Rome. Trained myself in the old Psychological philosophy, I early took a disgust for it, & I believe I may say without flattery, that I owe it to your writings that I ever pursued the study beyond the point which is considered a necessity. Lately I have adopted Brancherau as the basis of my course of lectures, after giving up the attempt to find a text book which I could endure, I only say this much about myself to show why the propositions are a difficulty to me.

I will make a few remarks upon them singly, & if it is not an intrusion upon your valuable time, I should really be greatly obliged by your informing me of your own views regarding them.

I may perhaps be allowed to add that, while I claim the liberty, as a thinking man, to hold views on many points different from your own, I am well pleased to give this full proof as a priest of my undiminished respect

[4] Father McMurdie's copy has not been preserved. The following statement of the propositions is taken from Guiseppe Morando, *Esame Critico delle XL Proposizioni Rosminiane condannate dalla S. R. U. Inquisizione* (Milano, 1905), pp. 905-906.

Decreto della S. R. U. I. sull' Ontologismo ed il Panteismo
(sotto Pio IX, a. 1861).

A Sanctae Romanae et Universalis Inquisitionis Congregatione postulatum est, utrum sequentes propositiones tuto tradi possint.

1. Immediata Dei cognitio, habitualis saltem, intellectui humano essentialis est, ita ut sine ea nihil cognoscere possit: siquidem est ipsum lumen intellectuale.
2. Esse illud, quod in omnibus et sine quo nihil intelligimus, est Esse divinum.
3. Universalia, a parte rei considerata, a Deo realiter non distinguuntur.
4. Congenita Dei tamquam entis simpliciter notitia omnem aliam cognitionem eminenti modo involvit, ita ut per eam omne ens, sub quocumque respectu cognoscibile est, implicite cognitum habeamus.
5. Omnes aliae ideae non sunt nisi modificationes ideae qua Deus tamquam ens simpliciter intelligitur.
6. Res creatae sunt in Deo tamquam pars in toto, non quidem in toto formali, sed in toto infinito, simplicissimo, quod suas quasi partes absque ulla sui divisione et diminutione extra se ponit.
7. Creatio sic explicari potest: Deus ipso actu speciali, quo se intelligit et vult tamquam distinctum a determinata creatura, homine v. g., creaturam producit.

Fer. 4 die 18 Septembris 1861.

In congregatione generali habita in conventu S. M. sup. Minervam coram Eminentissimis et Reverendissimis DD. S. R. E. Cardinalibus contra haereticam pravitatem in tota republica christiana Inquisitoribus Generalibus, iidem Eminentissimi et Reverendissimi DD. praehabito voto DD. Consultorum, omnibus et singulis propositionibus superius enunciatis mature perpensis, proposito dubio responderunt:—Negative.

both for your learning, & (what I presume we both value far more) undiminished fidelity to Holy Church to which we were both strangers once, & which I am sure, we each in our several walks of life desire to serve with the greater earnestness on that very account. Now to our immediate business—

No. 1. Strikes me as directly opposed to our system. I presume the "negative" can hardly fall on the second part, unless from a doubt whether it means that the knowledge (cognitio) of God, as distinct from God Himself is "lumen intellectuale", but I do not understand knowledge as possible distinct from the presence of its object in the knowing. Is there room for ambiguity in the word cognitio? Does it mean reflex, or intuitive, or is this ambiguity the difficulty?

No. 2. Seems to me ambiguous, & in the first clause capable of a Pantheistic sense. It could perhaps be explained to deny instead of affirm the primary synthesis.

No. 3. Bothers me fairly. I confess to having taught it totidem verbis nor do I see what to teach in its place if it cannot be taught any more.

No. 4. I plead guilty to not knowing exactly what "cognita notitia" may happen to be. Does the "negative" touch Malebranche or Gioberti? or would it fall on Rothenflue's "Ens in genere" what I always thought pantheism or nothing.

No. 5. I understand as the complement of No. 4. Does not the proposition rather deny than affirm the primary synthesis! Ens creat &c.

No. 6. I would condemn myself. Does it represent Moigno, whose writings I have read only in Brancherau's analysis.

No. 7. Does not strike me as essential to any system of Philosophy, & though it seems worth a discussion, is not of practical moment to me at present.

I understand that Mons. Carriére considers that he can no longer allow Brancherau to be taught in any Sulpician school. I dare say he is not sorry, if the truth were known.

I enclose the propositions in case you may not have seen them. If I am imposing too much trouble on you, do not hesitate to say so, & if it should ever happen to be in my power to reciprocate in any way for the trouble I have already given you, you will I trust let me know.

I remain, with great respect,
Dear Sir—
Your mo. obt. Sert.
[Signed] H. S. McMurdie

O. A. Brownson, Esqr.

ELIZABETH, N. J., MAY 9TH, /62.

REV. & DEAR SIR,

The propositions negatived by the S. Congregation had been through the kindness of a friend previously sent me. On first glancing over them I thought some poor blunderhead had been trying to caricature & get prohibited the doctrine defended in my Review. But, a second reading satisfied me that the one who drew up the propositions could have had no reference to the ideal or synthetic philosophy either as held by me, or as taught by Gioberti. I suspect they are aimed at the French & Belgian ontologists, &, perhaps, at the school of Rothenflue, or, more properly, *Père* Martin among the Jesuits.

I have never met any of the prohibited propositions *totidem verbis* in any author I have read, but I have heard something like some of them in conversation. But I am sure that neither you nor I, nor anyone else who could claim to be even a tyro in Philosophy, ever maintained the first proposition, *Immediata Dei cognitio, saltem habitualis*. Pray, what is habitual cognition? Cognition is always an act, never *habitus*, for *habitus* can be affirmed only of the cognitive faculty, never of the cognition. *Intellectui humano essentialis est*. Nonsense. Cognition is an act of the intellect, & presupposes it. *Ita ut sine ea nihil cognoscere possit. Implicat*. For cognition of God is itself to know something. *Siquidem est ipsum lumen intellectuale*. How can an act of the intellect be the very light of the intellect, when without the *lumen intellectuale* the intellect cannot act? I have maintained that God is himself the light, that is, the objective light of the intellect, but never that the cognition of God was that light. St. Thomas, St. Augustine, St. Bonaventure, Thomassin, Fenelon, & others maintain that the light of reason is Divine, & St. John tells us that the *Verbum*, who is God, is "the true light that enlighteneth every man coming into this world." The S. Congregation cannot mean to deny this.

The error is in confounding on the one hand *cognitio Dei* with *Deus* himself, & on the other in confounding cognition with intuition. Cognition is the act of the subject, is our act, &, like all human acts, a reflex act, & intuition is the act of the object, that is, of God affirming himself, & in affirming himself creating the human intellect, & becoming immediately in the act of affirmation itself the object & light of the intellect, its immanent & persistent object & light, without which it could neither exist nor act. God is the creative light of our light, & we see all things in & by him.

2. The second proposition denies the ideal formula, or that the *primum philosophicum* is *Ens creat existentias*. The Ideal in my philosophy is objective, & is always God as the intelligible, or God in the respect that he stands face to face with our intellect, & is cognized or cognizable. That which in every cognition is affirmed as necessary, universal, immutable, &

eternal, that is as ideal, is *esse divinum;* but not all that is cognized as really existing is the Divine being, for we apprehend *existens* as well as *ens*, & really, according to the formula, apprehend both, & in the same intuitive act.

3. Ideas which are the types of things in the Divine mind, the *essentiae rerum metaphysicae* of the Schoolmen, cannot be distinguished *a parte rei* from God, or the Divine essence. The mistake lies in confounding the *Universals* of the peripatetics with *ideas*. The Universals are properly *genera & species*, & *genera & species* are *methexis, participata*, real creations, & are God only *mediante* his creative act. They really exist distinct from God, only they do not subsist without individuation. Man is as real as man. The race is as really created as the individual, but the race is never without the individual, nor the individual without the race. You will find this matter, the *pons asinorum* of the Schoolmen, cleared up in the article in my Review for last October [5] on The Philosophy of Religion, pp. 467, 468, where I am explaining the meaning of the words *methexis & mimesis*.

4. The fourth proposition denies the formula, & would seem to be Rosminian. It is pantheistic, for the cognition of God as simple *ens* can in no sense involve the cognition of existences, unless they are assumed to be simple emanations, or evolutions, of his own entity, & not creatures at all.

5. The trouble here is with the word *idea*, which appears to be taken subjectively, as intellectual apprehension, not as the object of that apprehension. So taken, the proposition is false. Taken in my sense, a sense analogous to the Platonic, it, though absurdly expressed, might be admissible. The Idea is *Ens*, the Divine Being, & is necessarily one; but in this sense it admits of no modifications, & we can never say that all our intellections are simple modifications of our intellection (*sic*) apprehension of God. This would be sheer pantheism, & is denied by the Synthesis we assert.

6. The Sixth is evidently drawn up by some one who knew nothing of what he was talking about. Just as if God could place what is in himself as *pars in toto*, out of himself *absque ulla sua divisione & diminutione! Implicat. Infinitum* has no parts, & what has parts cannot place any of them out of itself without division or diminution. Neither you nor I can be affected by the *negative*, for we both hold, I presume, that *res creatae* are in God only *mediante actu suo creativo*.

7. The seventh proposition is inadmissible, because it likens the creative act of God to, & identifies it with the act of knowing himself, which is the eternal & immanent generation of the Word, & would therefore imply pantheism.

[5] "The Philosophy of Religion", *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, II (Third New York Series, Oct. 1861), 462-491.

These, Rev. & dear Sir, are a few of the remarks that occur to me in answer to your inquiries. I am informed that some of the French ontologists have inquired of the S. Congregation in what sense the teaching of the propositions enumerated are prohibited. There is not one of them that I should not myself, as I understand them, condemn. They seem to me to have been drawn up by some Cartesian or psychologist, who endeavored to give what he supposed to be a fair statement of the fundamental teachings of the ontologists, who can escape pantheism only at the expense of their logic. I am no more an ontologist than I am a psychologist. My philosophy is synthetic, & starts from the original synthesis of things.

The great point aimed at by the author of the propositions was, I presume, to get prohibited the doctrine that God is or can be in this life intuitively apprehended. In the sense of perception, or empyrical intuition, which is a subjective act, I do not hold it; but I do maintain that in every intellectual operation man has intuition of that which from revelation & reflection he learns *is* God. But this apprehension of God is in the formula, & therefore is the intuition of God *mediante* his creative act, or as the subject or first term of the Divine judgment *Ens creat existentias*.

I beg you to excuse the crudeness & imperfections of my remarks. I make them in haste, & amid much pain & suffering from a recent attack of gout. I thank you very kindly for expressing so generously your continued confidence in my fidelity to the Church, & pray you to believe me,

Truly & affectionately yours,

[Signed] O. A. Brownson

Rev. Prof. McMurdie,
Mt. St. Mary's College.

Thomas T. McAvoy

University of Notre Dame

II

Notes and Suggestions on the History of Naples in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries [1]

With the exception of occasional interest in the relations of Lord Nelson and Lady Hamilton in 1799, the "year of revolutions," and routine and wholesale denunciations of the Neapolitan Bourbons, little attention has been paid by non-Italian writers, and in particular by English and American scholars, to a delineation of the events of Neapolitan history in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This has too often meant that the information available to others than Italians has been taken from the most easily obtainable Italian sources, sources often rabidly partisan, and with little or no criticism. Since historical revision tends to lag in other than the mother tongue, many details concerning Naples have been treated in Italian monographs, which have yet to find their way into English to any appreciable extent. Consequently, a number of generalizations have appeared in the literature available to English readers, which, while perhaps not entirely false, in the light of recent research represent a greater or lesser variation from the truth.

If one excludes Maria Carolina, more controversy seems to have raged about the character of Cardinal Fabrizio Ruffo than about almost any other person in modern Neapolitan history. Protagonist of the counter-revolution which drove the French out of Naples, overthrew the short-lived Parthenopean republic and returned Ferdinand IV from Sicily to his palace at Caserta, Ruffo has been decried by ex-Jacobins, Freemasons and victims of the royalist reaction, as a medieval condottiere of the worst sort, a leader of ruffians and freebooters whose interest was not in *Santa Fede* and *San Gennaro*, but in pillage and the overthrow of any reform which would impair the re-establishment of royal and clerical "tyranny."

Unfortunately for those interested in objective history in the tradition of von Ranke, many historians have accepted this verdict on Cardinal Ruffo, using as sources the easily secured works of Colletta [2], Cuoco [3], and

[1] At the 1941 meeting of the American Historical Association, Professor Gaudens Megaro of Queens College read a paper on "Misconceptions in the History of Italy in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." In his discussion, Professor Megaro indicated several assumptions by writers of Italian history, and especially by English and American scholars, which were either partly or entirely false. This essay attempts to determine whether Italian regional history as typified by Naples may not suffer from partisan viewpoints or superficial observations, as does Italian national history.

[2] Pietro Colletta, *Storia del reame di Napoli dal 1734 al 1825* (Paris, 1835). Colletta was implicated in the republic of 1799 and later served as a general in King Joachim Murat's army. He attacks Ruffo very bitterly, Vol. I, p. 230:

Botta.[4] These writers, sympathetic to the Jacobin republic, have spared no effort to paint Ruffo as black as possible; and thus he is often described today in histories of Italy in the English language. This is not to imply that one may gain a true picture of Cardinal Ruffo by a perusal of the works of such Bourbon apologists as von Helfert[5], Sacchinelli[6], and Dumas[7], but rather to point out that even today, in both Italian and English histories of Naples, there is definite need for an unbiased investigation and character study of this prelate.

V. Ruffo[8] approaches the problem in a more moderate manner, clears up a number of details regarding the cardinal's life, and depicts him as a believer in conservative ideals rather than as a bigoted leader of cutthroats. Yet this work is not entirely satisfactory, as the author delib-

"Born of noble yet wretched stock, cunning by nature, ill-bred in youth, poor, a squanderer [and] wanton in old age, as a young man he had taken the rich and easy path to the prelacy. Having pleased the pontiff, Pius VI, he received a very high position in the Apostolic Camera; but because of too great and too sudden wealth, he lost office and papal favor..."

[3] Vincenzo Cuoco, *Saggio storico sulla rivoluzione di Napoli*, edited by Fausto Nicolini (Bari, 1913). Numerous editions of this work exist, the first being published in 1801. Cuoco, a politician and philosopher who had supported the Jacobin government, says for example, pp. 181-182: "Ruffo in the meantime was winning in Calabria.... Here his name gave him some followers; to these were added all of those condemned to death in the island of Sicily—pardon being promised to these latter [and] to all of the atrocious bandits who had come out of Calabria.... Impunity, rape, pillage, easy promises and superstitious fanaticism all combined to increase his followers."

[4] Carlo Botta, *Storia d'Italia del 1789 al 1814* (Paris, 1837), pp. 423-424, adds this lurid tale: "a priest who had come with Ruffo boasted of having eaten the broiled flesh of republicans.... Ruffo saw these things and would not or could not restrain them."

[5] Joseph Alexander von Helfert, *Fabrizio Ruffo. Revolution und Gegenrevolution von Neapel, November 1798 bis August 1799* (Vienna, 1882).

[6] Domenico Sacchinelli, *Memorie storiche sulla vita del cardinale Fabrizio Ruffo* (Naples, 1836). Sacchinelli was a priest who served as Ruffo's private secretary. His book has been questioned on the grounds that he was a pensioner of the Bourbon government after 1799, receiving 200 ducats yearly, and that his book was written almost forty years after the events described. Sacchinelli's history may be compared with one written only two years after the revolution: D. Petromasi, *Storia della spedizione dell'eminentissimo cardinale Don Fabrizio Ruffo* (Naples, 1801).

[7] Alexandre Dumas, *I Borboni di Napoli* (Naples, 1862-1863).

[8] V. Ruffo, *Il Cardinale Fabrizio Ruffo e la controrivoluzione del 1799* (Naples, 1919).

erately sets out to exculpate Ruffo from the charges made against him rather than to present an impartial picture. Also useful is a recent work by Antonio Manes [9] which rehabilitates the actions of the churchman and shows that his firmness in dealing with the republicans was desired by King Ferdinand rather than by himself. Manes points out also that it was Lord Nelson and not Ruffo who violated the terms of the republican capitulation agreement. A definitive work on Cardinal Ruffo has yet to be written, for though the Italians have made some efforts to cast new light on this statesman, histories in the English language still follow the party line of Colletta and others [10].

A second problem which has been studied by Italian historians, but remains to be investigated in other countries, is that of the reasons for the return of King Joachim Murat from Corsica in 1815. It will be remembered that this return resulted in his capture by the Bourbon government and his prompt execution at Pizzo on October 13, 1815.

For a number of years there existed the legend which accused many Muratists of having betrayed the unfortunate king, calling on him to return to Naples, encouraging him with false news of conditions under the restored Bourbons, all of this with the full and complete knowledge of the Neapolitan government. Though the falsity of this tale had been indicated several times, it was not until 1917 that the story was finally laid to rest when Giustino Fortunato republished the very important instructions given by Murat to one of his followers on the eve of his departure from Corsica. These instructions indicate that the return to Naples was entirely Murat's idea, and was not inspired by Bourbon hirelings [11].

An excellent topic for a doctoral dissertation would be a re-examination of the problem of the Sicilian constitution of 1812. While many monographic articles have appeared on the subject, there is still room for a careful and exhaustive treatment, using both British and Italian archival materials.

Unfortunately, Anglophobia in Italy — and this particularly since the advent of Fascism—has somewhat retarded an unbiased consideration of this constitutional experiment. Two views have been expressed: one, that

[9] Antonio Manes, *Un Cardinale condottiere. Fabrizio Ruffo e la repubblica partenopea* (Aquila, 1930).

[10] Constance H. D. Giglioli, *Naples in 1799* (London, 1903), is typical of those who have followed Colletta's views. She says (p. 168) that none of "his chief apologists and admirers can show us anything lofty, noble or heroic in Ruffo. In his own letters he appears a man of no great culture, unscrupulous in the means he employed for the ends he set before himself, cynically indifferent to the niceties of morality and even to the lives of his fellow men where he saw any advantage in sacrificing them."

[11] Giustino Fortunato, *L'Ultimo autografo politico di re Gioacchino* (Firenze, 1917).

instead of being a move toward a liberal government, the 1812 constitution was a mere pseudo-democratic scheme to tie Sicily more closely to the tail of the British kite and forward London's Mediterranean policy; the other, of course, that Lord Bentinck made an effort to introduce real liberal institutions into Sicily on the English model.

Whatever the answer may be, a good deal of study might profitably be given to the question. It would not be necessary that this be entirely new research; even a synthesis of existing materials would certainly be of great value [12].

The period of the restoration at Naples has been more than often depicted by British writers as a return to a despotism more despicable than that of the Turk, and the Bourbons have been represented as crude and inhuman betrayers of Neapolitan liberties. No representative of the dynasty has suffered more from these charges than Ferdinand II, the last but one of the Neapolitan kings. Writing in 1898, Bolton King presented a word picture of this monarch and perpetuated statements which had long since been disproved:

> His people did not know that he was a true Bourbon, cruel and crass and proud as they; ill-educated, superstitious, a tyrant by instinct . . . But his boorish brutality killed his wife, the gentle Cristina of Savoy, and to his friends and servants he was faithless on principle, "The world,"

[12] The more useful monographs dealing with Sicily during this period may be cited: Giuseppe Bianco, *La Sicilia durante l'occupazione inglese, 1806-1815* (Palermo, 1902); Emilio Del Cerro (pseudonym of Nicola Niceforo), "Maria Carolina d'Austria e la politica inglese in Sicilia, 1805-1817," in *Atti accademici* (Acireale, 1907-1908), and "La Sicilia e la costituzione del 1812," in *Archivio storico siciliano*, New Series, Vols. 38-46 (Palermo, 1913-1925); R. Di Mattei, "La Cultura politica inglese in Sicilia fra il Sette e l'Ottocento," in *Rivista d'Italia*, fascicolo 2, pp. 208-222 (Rome, 1924); Luigi Genuardi, *Gli Atti del parliamento siciliano* (Bologna, 1927), and "Tommaso Natale e la costituzione siciliana del 1812," in *Archivio storico siciliano*, New Series, Vol. 43, pp. 361-368 (Palermo, 1922); Francesco Guardione, *Maria Carolina d'Austria e la politica inglese in Sicilia* (Acireale, 1909); R. M. Johnston, *Mémoire de Marie Caroline, reine de Naples intitulé De la révolution du royaume de Sicilie par un témoin oculaire* (Cambridge, 1912); H. M. Lackland, "The Failure of the Constitutional Experiment in Sicily, 1813-1814," in the *English Historical Review*, 41 (1926), 210-235; Luigi Palma, "La Costituzione siciliana del 1812," in *Nuova Antologia di scienze, lettere ed arti*, Vol. 134, pp. 44-76, 677-707, Vol. 135, pp. 713-733, Vol. 136, pp. 104-120 (Rome, 1894); Niccolò Palmieri, *Saggio storico sulla costituzione del regno di Sicilia infino al 1816* (Lausanna, 1847); E. Pontieri, *Ai Margini della costituzione siciliana del 1812*, in *Atti del XXV° Congresso della Società Nazionale del Risorgimento* (Rome, 1932); Viscount Castlereagh, *Memoirs and Correspondence* (London, 1850-1853).

> he is reported to have said, "likes to be made a fool of, and a King should be the first adept at the business."[13]

Until the year 1848, Ferdinand was generally regarded as a moderate and satisfactory ruler by both liberals and conservatives; and in some quarters it was suggested that he might even lead the movement for Italian unification[14]. But caught between the opposing forces of Sicilian autonomists and Neapolitan constitutionalists and unionists, he was forced in defense of his throne to take steps to suppress the revolt in Sicily and at home, which won him the undying hatred of liberals everywhere. Though justifications may be found for his every move and extenuating circumstances which would delight an apologist, these have generally been overlooked, and the universal opprobrium which William E. Gladstone's attacks on his government increased, has ever since dogged his memory.

The Berkeleys in their series, *Italy in the Making*, have done useful work in rehabilitating Ferdinand's career, a rehabilitation which has not even yet been accepted by all Italian historians[15]. Many people have never seen anything in the Bourbons except obstacles to Italian national unity. Thus as late as 1938 Luigi Salvatorelli, a contemporary student of Italian history, wrote:

> He was gifted with unusual personal and political talents. The ruler of the largest state, the head of the strongest army in Italy, and in no ways compromised by the perjury and reaction of 1820 and the following years, many set their hopes on him and his entry into Naples was greeted with shouts of "Long live the King of Italy." But his mentality, debased by that side of his nature which was akin to the Neapolitan *lazzarone*, and cramped by a superstitious and bigoted piety, was incapable of rising to the height of such an ideal.[16]

[13] Bolton King, *A History of Italian Unity*, 3rd revised edition (London, 1924), Vol. I, 137-138. In 1867 the Piedmontese historian Nicomede Bianchi investigated the legend that Ferdinand was responsibile for Maria Cristina's death by pulling away a chair and causing her to fall while she was *enceinte*. He disproved the story completely. Later the Sicilian historian Francesco Guardione examined the charge and found it without basis. See Vol. 2, 277, note 15, of the Berkeley series cited below.

[14] Francesco Guardione, *Il Dominio dei Borboni in Sicilia* (Palermo, 1907), 1, 73: "His administrative and political provisions earned Ferdinand the reputation of being an excellent prince, both in Sicily and Naples."

[15] G. F.-H. Berkeley, *Italy in the Making*, Vol. 1, *1815 to 1846*; G. F.-H. and J. Berkeley, Vol. 2, *June 1846 to 1 January 1848*, and Vol. 3, *January 1st 1848 to November 16th 1848* (Cambridge, 1932-1940).

[16] Luigi Salvatorelli, *A Concise History of Italy* (New York, 1940), p. 537. Translated by Bernard Miall.

Thus one may see that here, as in the case of Cardinal Ruffo, there is opportunity for further research and character studies.

The final topic which may be touched upon is that of the status of the Bourbon government in 1859 and 1860, and its manifest inability to meet the challenge of the Garibaldians. Credit for the overthrow of Francis II is so often concentrated on Cavour and Garibaldi, that the peculiar conditions existing in Naples at the moment, which made the coup possible, are often overlooked.

For example, the concentration of supreme powers in the hands of the monarch—and in the case of Francis, an unskilled ruler—with the consequent unwillingness of anyone else to assume responsibility, should be noted. A bureaucracy of third class men, the continued illness of the chief ministers of state (the foreign minister Carafa was unable to do more than sign despatches, Winspeare, minister for internal affairs, was deaf, and Cassisi, minister for Sicily, was always sick—and the *dolce far niente* attitude of the conservatives all tended to produce a governmental impasse. This along with the hatred of the lower classes for the nobles, the desire of everyone to be on the winning side, and the propaganda of the Kingdom of Upper Italy promising all things to all men, caused a ferment which made the Bourbon state even more vulnerable from without.

These points are effectively indicated in an article which appeared in the *Archivio storico italiano*, publishing selections from the memoirs of Ludovico Bianchini, a minister in the government of King Ferdinand [17]. Nevertheless and despite this, it is often made to appear that the Bourbon government collapsed under its own weight at the first clarion call of Garibaldi, and that the collapse was immediately followed by a unanimous movement of all classes to join the new order. Once again, here is a fertile field for historical investigation.

To conclude, one may say that there are many opportunities for research in Neapolitan history, and a need to publish in English some of the newer viewpoints that have been advanced by Italian writers on the Two Sicilies. English and American historians have always neglected Italy, being more interested—and perhaps rightly so—in unearthing the history of their own countries. Perhaps the language difficulty has caused some to hesitate from investigation of Italian fields. Be that as it may, the fact would seem to remain that until more historians are willing to make use of recent Italian sources, Neapolitan and Italian history will be burdened with such inadequacies or misconceptions as indicated above.

DUANE KOENIG

University of Wisconsin

[17] Emma De Vincentiis, "La Caduta della monarchia borbonica in un'opera inedita di Ludovico Bianchini," in *Archivio storico italiano*, Series 7, 4 (1925), 77-84.

BOOK REVIEWS

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

The Mantle of Elias. By M. Leona Nichols. (Portland: Binfords & Mort. 1941. Pp. 337. $2.50.)

This is a fictionized account of the life and work of Francis Norbert Blanchet, first archbishop of Oregon City. Opening with the announcement that "The Blanchets have a baby," the writer's first chapters describe the years at the home at St. Francis, school days at St. Pierre across the river, and the first break in the group when Francis and his younger brother, Magloire, left to go to Quebec where both studied at the seminary and prepared for the priesthood. The activity of Father Blanchet among the Micmacs of New Brunswick is sketched, as well as his ministry at Montreal, where he distinguished himself by his devoted service during the cholera epidemic of 1832. Then follows the story of the journey to Oregon and the work of the pioneer priest and his associate, Father Modeste Demers.

The successes and failures of those first years of Catholicism in Oregon live again in the pleasantly readable account here given. The plans and ambitions of Fathers Blanchet and Demers, their consolations and disappointments in their contacts with Indians and whites during their almost constant traveling from one station to another are vividly depicted, and life in the pioneer west is graphically described. The figure of John McLoughlin stands out, a commanding kindly autocrat. That of Modeste Demers, Father Blanchet's loyal friend, later to be first bishop of Vancouver Island, is well portrayed, as is the character of the missionary himself.

The book, however, lacks any discussion of the real issues of those early years. It fails to clarify the relationship between the Hudson Bay officials and the missionaries. It makes no attempt to show the difficulties of trying to manage Oregon missions from Quebec and the efforts of Father Blanchet to convince his superiors of the necessity of a bishop for the Columbia Territory. No real account of Blanchet's great ideal for his vicariate is given—his plan for an extensive province of several dioceses with their center at Oregon City—a plan which he presented at Rome and which received ecclesiastical approbation.

Some attempt is made at "footnoting" but the method is confusing, often two separate and distinct references on a page being numbered (1). There are some slips. Among them, reference is made to the archbishop of

Quebec in 1838 (p. 43), but it was not until 1844 that Quebec was formally organized into a province and that title used; Blanchet was appointed vicar general of the bishop of Quebec when he was named for the Oregon missions in 1838 and not in 1843, as is implied (p. 156); there was little question of Bishop Provencher consecrating Blanchet a bishop in 1845; Archbishop Signay would have been the logical person but he was absent from Quebec and so was replaced by Bishop Bourget.

The appendix contains an interesting collection of old Oregon church records. There is no index.

SISTER LETITIA MARY LYONS

Holy Names College
Spokane

The Attitude of the Northern Clergy Toward the South, 1860-1865. By CHESTER F. DUNHAM. (Toledo, Ohio: Gray Co. Publishers. 1942. Pp. xi, 258. $3.50.)

This work, completed as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Chicago, is described by the author as a "clerico-political study . . . to discover the mind of the Northern Clergy . . . toward the South from 1860 through 1865, and incidentally during the decade of the fifties." Mr. Dunham finds that the northern clergymen were not a unit in thought or action toward the South, but that *possibly* the majority were opposed to slavery, secession, the Confederacy, and to easy terms of reconstruction.

This is a conservative conclusion, not only in view of the sentiment expressed in so many of the clerical opinions quoted by the author, but also in the light of remarks made by secular newspapers and commentators of the day. Study of the party affiliations of the ministers would give further support to this partial disagreement with Mr. Dunham's findings, for, during the Civil War, most northern clergymen, particularly in New England, were Republicans. Federalist in the early days of the national government, they both feared and hated Jeffersonian democracy when it came; later they inclined to the Whigs and finally became Republicans. Thus, both as clergymen and as citizens they differed with the Democrats on the questions of "popery," liquor reform, and slavery. In respect of slavery they naturally assumed that the Republican method of dealing with it was the true one. Thus there is suggested the question, which Mr. Dunham himself raises but does not seem to have answered clearly, viz., whether the clergy, particularly in predominantly Republican sections of the country, led public opinion or merely voiced or reflected it.

Mr. Dunham either did not deem considerations of this sort of importance or else he overlooked their value, for they find no place in his study. He chose to make his findings by sampling northern clerical opinion from

New England to the Mississippi. This method is quite satisfactory as far as pulpit and editorial utterances are concerned, but it does not always discover the true mind of the individual clergyman, much less the causal factors which enable the reader to appreciate clerical attitudes.

The work also shows a lack of care in revision of the manuscript and in proofreading the copy. Instances of faulty grammar are numerous. A noticeable indifference to mechanics is apparent; sentence faults and punctuation errors are too frequent, while inconsistency in the use of capitals is sometimes found on the same page. One may observe that Harpers Ferry is spelled without an apostrophe (p. 60). In the 1860's one would scarcely expect to meet "ministers . . . who had maintained their pacifist position from colonial days . . ." (p. 117). Lincoln was not shot on February 14, 1865.

These are but a few examples of the carelessness which is too general in a doctoral dissertation. Mr. Dunham has quite definitely established the position of the northern clergy on the great issues of the years 1850-1865, but his study does not manifest sufficient attention to mechanical detail.

BROTHER J. ROBERT LANE

Saint Mary's College
Winona

Stuffed Saddlebags: The Life of Martin Kundig, Priest, 1805-1879. By PETER LEO JOHNSON, D.D., Professor of Church History, St. Francis Seminary, St. Francis, Wisconsin. Foreword by the Most Reverend Moses E. Kiley, D.D., Archbishop of Milwaukee. (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1942. Pp. viii, 297. $3.00.)

Everybody knows that Catholicism in the United States is largely the product of the great nineteenth century immigration from Europe. Not only did the Catholic immigrants by their numbers, material support, and general attitude of loyalty supply the main driving power under heaven to the prosperous advance of the Church within our borders; they also, with the immigrants of other faiths, became a tremendous factor in the development of the American commonwealth as a whole. Recent historians, Marcus Hansen and Carl Wittke in particular, have begun to elaborate the theme in penetrating studies, conspicuous among them being the latter's *The Saga of the Immigrant: We Who Built America.* As to the spectacular evolution of American Catholicism, if ever the story of it is put on record with adequate detail, large tribute will have to be paid to the part played in the historic process by the pastors of foreign birth. The book under review reveals with emphasis how much the Church in the United States could be indebted to a single one of them.

Stuffed Saddlebags is the story of a priest on horseback who rode the missionary circuit in the heroic days of immigration. Swiss-born, Martin

Kundig, as he moves through the pages of this engaging biography, is indeed a most arresting figure. Nature and grace combined to fit him with admirable precision into the American milieu. Six feet tall, of robust physique and engaging presence, handy man at all things practical, skillful horseman, expert musician, accomplished singer, adept in English, effective preacher, teetotaler and non-smoker, Kundig had the entrée into all circles, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. His social gifts were outstanding; he was a "mixer" in the best connotation of the term. Among spiritual assets he counted a serene and simple faith, a trust in Providence that never bent, but carried him through impossible situations.

Together with his schoolmate and life-long friend, the future Bishop Henni, Martin Kundig was raised to the priesthood by Bishop Edward Fenwick in Cincinnati in 1829. Fifty years later he passed away at seventy-four as pastor of St. John's Church in Milwaukee. Three fields of labor were blessed by his ministry, southern Ohio, Detroit, and Milwaukee. In Brown County, Ohio he served amid staggering hardships a poverty-stricken rural flock, helping with his own hands to put up a cabin and a chapel, both of logs, cooking his own meals, incurring all the time no expenses, for as he explained, "he had nothing to spend." In Detroit he became a local celebrity through his heroic exertions during a cholera epidemic which hit the future automobile capital in 1834 with devastating fury. There was no city hospital. Father Kundig improvised one and with the aid of willing workers from among the Catholic young women of the city started to take care of the plague-stricken. Rigging up a sort of ambulance, he traversed the city day and night searching out the sick, carrying them himself from their homes into the ambulance, and then serving their needs at the improvised hospital. His cholera treatment proved singularly effective and many trusted him more than the doctors. The whole city reacted in admiration at his amazing charity and he was appointed Wayne County Superintendent of the Poor, which meant the direction of all the county's official charities. Here again he showed himself an adept in organization and administration, but his success ran him into personal debt. As part reimbursement for his losses, the Michigan legislature voted him $3,000, an appropriation said to be unique in the history of that body. The official history of Wayne County's relief institutions, dedicated to his memory, "takes particular pride in the first member of the board," Reverend Martin Kundig.

In Wisconsin, where he labored thirty-seven years (1842-1879), Father Kundig was above all founder, builder, co-operator in general in organizing the nascent diocese of Milwaukee, which he served for years in the capacity of vicar-general. He built twenty-two churches, ten of which were log, seven frame, two of brick, and three of stone. In mid-1845 he was busy putting up a dozen chapels. Curiously enough, though German was his

native tongue, he worked by predilection among English-speaking groups. His temperance activities in Wisconsin were state-wide, and yielded the most palpable results. In Milwaukee in 1843 he organized and directed a huge St. Patrick's Day temperance demonstration and parade which, so Father Johnson records, "made the day historic in Wisconsin and church annals."

No one could have been better equipped than Father Kundig with the traits, natural and acquired, that made for popularity and influence in the environments in which he moved. His avowed and genuine Americanism especially stood him in excellent stead. He would proudly proclaim to his hearers that he came from a land steeped in republican traditions and was therefore in a position to appreciate aright the institutions of his adopted country. Flag-waving among us has not escaped the taunts of the cynical. The bare fact is that the ecclesiastics most successful in winning public respect and sympathy for the Catholic Church in the United States have been conspicuous for it.

Professor Johnson has written a fascinating book. Here is rescued from oblivion and set before us a singularly colorful, dynamic, edifying clerical actor in the great drama of Catholic upgrowth on American soil. Vivid, graphic detail and a sprightly narrative make the volume very readable. The inspiration packed within its covers is vocal and need escape no one. In these Christless days it is comforting to be made to realize once again what a vast deal of moral, religious, social beneficence and uplift can be achieved by the man in whom functions "the charity of Christ that surpasseth all knowledge."

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN

Loyola University
Chicago

MODERN HISTORY

The Huguenots: Fighters for God and Human Freedom. By OTTO ZOFF. Translated by E. B. Ashton and Jo Mayo. (New York: L. B. Fisher. 1942. Pp. vii, 340. $3.50.)

The author is a distinguished Czech art critic, playwright, and biographer now in New York. The work is a frankly popular one intended to be entertaining as well as informative. In spite of a long bibliography, (pp. 337-350), it does not contain a single reference or footnote enabling the student to check the author's statements or appreciations. The spirit in which it was written is revealed by the gruesome picture which appears on the jacket: a scene of St. Bartholomew's day, men and women thrown into a street in Paris, bodies hanging, heads rolling from a scaffold, under the gaze of the king and of gentlemen and ladies of the

court. Has the story been written in view of the screen? A reviewer of the New York *Times* cannot help underscoring the "gaudy, dramatic and romantic" character of the story.

There is no doubt as to whom the sympathy of the author goes in his picture of the religious wars which soaked with blood the soil of France from the first Huguenot rebellion in 1560 to the fall of La Rochelle in 1629. The Huguenots were "saints and heroes, clothed in the armor of moral and physical courage", while on the other side kings, queens, generals, ministers of the Church and State were crossing the bloody stage of intrigue and violence.

Indeed that age was an age of intrigue and violence and no Catholic historian attemps to palliate the excesses which were perpetrated in the name of religion. However, we need not go outside of Mr. Zoff's story to discover, not an excuse, but a psychological and political explanation of the cruelty and mercilessness of the struggle. "Soldiers of different nations fight each other with a passion not their own; but when a people engage in civil war, it is because some despise what the others hold sacred." Had the Huguenots been only "a people prepared to die for their simple faith"—and no doubt there were many who suffered only for their faith—we might pity their delusion and respect their courage. But while the initial difference between Huguenots and Catholics may have arisen "over the theological interpretation of holy communion," the movement soon took the character of a political and social revolution, attempts were made to set up a state within the state, and Frenchmen looked for allies in their campaigns among foreign nations. It is not necessary to whitewash Catherine and her three sons or the leaders of the League party to understand that it was the national instinct of self-preservation which rallied around them the great majority of the French people who, at the end, gave their hearty allegiance to Henry IV when his conversion gave promise of the restoration of peace.

One or two examples will suffice to illustrate the author's readiness to follow the pattern of misrepresentation of the Church's teaching and of Catholic churchmen. He says of Ravaillac, the murderer of Henry IV, that he "was only a pupil of the great school of fanaticism. He had read the Jesuit books commending regicide for the greater glory of the Church" (p. 268). His picture of Richelieu reminds one of the picture of the cardinal statesman popularized by the novels of Alexandre Dumas. Even here his imagination seems to play havoc with his logic. Thus in the same paragraph (pp. 295-296), he paints the cardinal as "deathly pale with prayer", and raises doubt "whether at heart this priest was not quite consciously indifferent to God. Again, it is on the lips of this "silky sneak" (p. 295) that he places this moving plea for clemency in behalf of the rebels of La Rochelle: "Sire, never before has a prince had such opportunity to shine in the eyes of present and future generations.

If we are created in God's image, the King above all must prove it by clemency and mercy, by the joy he takes in doing good . . . the King's greatness of heart will appear all the purer the more purely he forgives" (p. 312). The *Times* reviewer was right. This is a dramatic and romantic story. It has no claim to history.

JULES A. BAISNÉE

Catholic University of America

Memoirs of the Life and Peregrinations of the Florentine, Philip Mazzei, 1730-1816. Translated by Howard R. Marraro. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1942. Pp. xvi, 447. $4.00.)

Fortunately one of the common misconceptions of Italy, that it was apathetic and stagnant in the eighteenth century, has been revised. If Philip Mazzei cannot be considered a star of first magnitude in the Italian intellectual revolution, his activity and versatility made him more famous than most of his countrymen who came to America in the eighteenth century. His memoirs are those of a medical student, a rather unwilling practitioner, a teacher, a merchant, a horticulturist, a pamphleteer, Virginia's representative in Europe, and Stanislaus II's agent in Paris. One of the best examples of his energy was the thoroughness and business-like procedure which he displayed at the age of seventy-five in employing, at Jefferson's request, two sculptors for decorating the capitol in Washington.

The journeys of Mazzei started in 1752 by his leaving Tuscany to go to Smyrna. After a residence in Smyrna for three years, in London nearly eighteen years, in Virginia from 1773 to 1779 and from 1783 to 1785, and in Paris, with visits to Holland, Poland, and Italy, he returned to Tuscany in 1792 and remained there until his death in 1816, with the exception of a trip to St. Petersburg. The glimpses of education in Tuscany, modes of travelling, money lending, censorship in Italy, and living conditions in several countries are incidental and overshadowed by his account of the American Revolution, the French Revolution, and the last years of independent Poland. He numbered among his acquaintances George Washington, John Adams, Condorcet, the Countess of Albany, Alfieri, Marquis Tanucci, Cardinal Antonelli, Sir Horace Mann, and Archduke Leopold, and among his friends Adams, Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Marquis Caracciolo, Stanislaus II, and many others. His views about democracy, personal liberty, parliamentary government, and education are especially interesting. With no desire to be pedantic, the reviewer noticed his criticism of the road constructed by Leopold from Modena to Pistoia (p. 372). His description serves as an excellent example of how the opinion of a contemporary differs from that of a later writer. Spellanzon calls that road one of the "magnificent arteries," no doubt with the view that any road was better than no road (*Storia del Risorgimento e dell'Unità d'Italia*, I, 59).

Four months after Mazzei died, Thomas Jefferson stated that Mazzei's writings would be a valuable source for American history. Twenty-nine years elapsed before the memoirs were published in 1845-46, and then nearly a century passed before they appeared in this translation, their first English edition. Professor Marraro's very readable translation is a valuable contribution. His preface, the separation into chapters, the chronological list, the bibliography, and the index are helpful aids. The memoirs should be used with Professor Marraro's publication, *Philip Mazzei, Virginia's Agent in Europe, the story of his mission as related in his own dispatches and other documents,* and with Raffaele Ciampini's *Lettere di Filippo Mazzei alla Corte di Polonia (1788-1792)*, of which only the first volume has appeared in the United States.

MARY LUCILLE SHAY

University of Illinois

The Man Who Sold Louisiana. The Career of François Barbé-Marbois. By E. WILSON LYON. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1942. Pp. xix, 240. $2.75.)

For sixty-six years François Barbé-Marbois was an official of the government of France. The length of his public career was in itself extraordinary. Still more extraordinary, however, was the fact that during that long period he served under Louis XV, Louis XVI, the Convention, the Directory, the Consulate, Napoleon I, Louis XVIII, Charles X, and Louis Philippe. Beginning as secretary to the French legation at Ratisbon, he was stationed successively in Dresden, Vienna, Munich, and Philadelphia.

Since he was a son of the bourgeoisie the higher ranks of the foreign service under the *ancien regime* were closed to him. When, in 1785, his term as chargé d'affaires to the young United States drew to a close, he left the foreign service to become the last royal intendant of Santo Domingo. In that position he demonstrated an ability in the field of public finance that was destined to shape his future career. During the French Revolution, Marbois served as minister to Ratisbon and Vienna, as mayor of the city of Metz, and as president of the Council of Ancients under the Directory. In 1797 he was exiled to Guiana, where he was held until 1800, by which time Napoleon was in control in France. Pardoned by the First Consul, he became a member of the Council of State, director general of the public treasury, and minister of the public treasury. While holding this latter office he negotiated the sale of Louisiana to the United States.

Marbois became first president of the Cour des Comptes in 1807, and held that office until his final retirement from public life in 1834. In the meantime he served in the Senate of the Empire, on the commission which approved the constitution of the Restoration, in the House of Peers during

the reign of Louis XVIII, and as Minister of Finance under that monarch. Other interests he had, and other honors were paid him. His charitable works were many, his writings voluminous, and his interest in public education and penal reform farseeing. Napoleon made him a count of the Empire; Louis XVIII, a marquis. All in all, his career was a distinguished one for a merchant's son to have realized.

This biography, not too long, but satisfying and scholarly in its approach, well illustrates the attitude of a moderate man in times of crisis. It makes pleasant reading and widens a bit more the horizons of history surrounding the period of Marbois' life.

JOHN J. MENG

Queens College

The Great Republic. By Ross J. S. HOFFMAN. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1942. Pp. xv, 167. $2.25.)

The League of Nations has been under fire from the moment of its inception; during the past five years the literature of criticism has multiplied. It is something of a tribute to the past efficacy of the League in the social and economic sphere, and something of hope for the future, that with the passage of time the tone of criticism has veered from destructive to constructive. Some critics have gone to the extent of offering a substitute organization after the present holocaust is ended. This is not Ross Hoffman's purpose; although he writes of the League as finished, he is concerned not with the constitution of the future society, rather with the base on which it must rest.

He believes that the failure of the League is due not so much to systemic deficiencies as to the fact that it was too much an embodiment of doctrinaire rationalism and liberalism, too much a council of theorists blind to the realities of the historic states of Europe. International organization will be successful only when account is taken of the greater community inherent in western civilization. The larger part of his brief but compact book deals with the ethical community of Christendom, more extensive than the membership in the Church, which has served as foundation for previous associations of states, as well as for the foundation of the Holy Roman Empire, the predecessor of the national state system and of international law.

Careful consideration of the thesis of this book is recommended to students of international affairs, especially to those who may be responsible for terms of peace. Written from thorough knowledge and personal integration of history, it contains the outlines of earlier plans and agencies for the organization of international peace, with keen interpretation of their relationship to national policy. If there be any criticism, it is of

the book's brevity. One would like to ask whether national states have not tried as consistently to absorb the Church as did the Holy Roman Empire, and with equally devastating effect; whether narrow tribalism within the Church as well as within the political community has not hindered the development of an effective international order on the national state level; by what specific forms of organization the Atlantic Charter can be turned into the "charter of restoration" it gives promise of becoming. These are questions we hope other books of Professor Hoffman may answer.

ELIZABETH M. LYNSKEY

Hunter College

AMERICAN HISTORY

Democratic-Republican Societies, 1790-1800. By EUGENE PERRY LINK. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1942. Pp. xii, 256. $2.75.)

This is an apologia for the popular associations so intimately connected with the beginnings of American constitutional life. Dr. Link presents the story of their origin, their activities, and their influences on government during the formative years of the Federal Union. It is a story completely and expertly documented, and from it the societies emerge as the protectors of democratic liberties.

Although they varied greatly in their interests and in their methods of operation, the societies were united in their desire to direct the new American government along the path of democracy and away from the more familiar and autocratic devices of traditional organization. "All the societies, without exception, were early American pressure groups that doled out their blessings or their curses on the representatives in Congress who affirmed or defied their interest" (p. 149). The varied activities of the popular societies stemmed directly from the local or sectional problems with which each was confronted. Concerted action resulted from common disagreement with the policies of the national government. The membership of the various groups was diverse in character, and included professional men, government officials, merchants, mechanics, and a considerable sprinkling from social strata of less exalted station. These men were concerned not with overthrowing government, but "with defending and preserving the Revolution and liberty" (p. 155).

Their activities did not go unchallenged, for they were not quixotically tilting against windmills. One of the major contributions of the volume is the new light it casts upon the procedures and motivations of Federalist government under Washington. The supporters of our earliest political administration under the Constitution tended towards an aristocratic implementation of that document, and this tendency the societies combatted

without surcease. The tactics utilized by the Federalists in turn to discredit the societies, succeeded in creating an altogether false illusion about their membership and aims, an illusion that has persisted until the present in the writings of many historians. The reasons for the collapse of the Federalist Party are traced in this volume to much more fundamental causes than those to which it has frequently been ascribed. The societies, with all their faults and pettinesses, were continuing the struggle for democratic rights begun in America by the radical leaders of the Revolution. Their success was in no small way responsible for the continuance of the youthful democratic tradition. They performed various services in realizing their aims. "Not only as sponsors of forums, as disseminators of information and opponents of restrictive acts designed to suppress free speech, but also as champions of public schools, as benefactors of early colleges, and as pioneers in female education, the people's societies and their members made contributions. These clubs were powerful instruments both for and in behalf of public instruction" (p. 173).

This book is a mature and penetrating investigation in the field of public opinion and its influence upon government policy. It contains lessons for the present as well as information about the past. It is well-written, thoroughly documented, and provided with all that could be desired in the way of aids to further research.

JOHN J. MENG

Queens College

Uncle Sam's Step Children: The Reformation of United States Indian Policy, 1865-1887. By LORING BENSON PRIEST. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1942. Pp. xii, 308. $3.75.)

Relations between the red men and the white in this country have been regulated in the main, not by clear-sighted statesmen, but by the *vox populi* of a heterogeneous, fickle democracy. Land-greedy mobs, speculators, traders, grafters, politicians, bureaucrats, soldiers, sentimentalists, philanthropists, and the churches have all had their say in the administration of Indian affairs. Policy at any given time has been a compromise between many conflicting interests and ideals.

Dr. Priest capably covers an interesting and important quarter-century of Indian policy and administration. During this time ensued the death struggle of the traditional system of evicting the tribes from their hunting grounds along the fast-moving frontier and of segregating them in no man's land and leaving them to their own devices. Thereupon followed the long parturition of a new policy, which was to eventuate in a program for assimilating the Indians into our cultural, economic, and political life. Meanwhile various experiments both in policy and in administration were tried out, such as the ration system, the attempt to concentrate the

Indians on two large reservations, the demolition of tribal government, the creation of the Board of Indian Commissioners to strangle graft and to check the abuse of bureaucracy, and the development of the federal Indian school system.

The author's major aim is to set forth the issues involved in the heated controversies about Indian affairs which took place in and out of Congress, and to describe the tactics of the protagonists in these debates. Of particular interest to him is the formulation of the Severalty Act of 1887, prescribing the allotment of lands to individual Indians and their eventual emancipation from wardship. He has evidently made a diligent and intelligent study of the extensive primary sources, such as the mass of official records, the publications of the leading Indian welfare organizations, contemporary books, pamphlets, and magazine and newspaper articles. His work is fully and carefully documented. His own comments and appraisals are frequent, interesting, and generally judicious. There is room for reasonable differences of opinion, of course, about many of the controversial subjects with which he has dealt and which are still in the controversial stage. It should be said, however, that he has produced an excellent book. It easily stands above every other work on the history of Indian policy that has appeared.

Uncle Sam's Step Children will be a valuable aid to the study of the Indian missions during the seventies and eighties. Of particular interest is the chapter, "Church Nomination of Indian Officials", an experiment which formed part of President Grant's Peace Policy. It outlines the history of this short-lived and none too successful experiment, noting the inherent as well as the extraneous difficulties with which it had to contend. Some readers will regret the impression which the chapter on "The Problem of Indian Education" gives. While it is true that the inauguration of the now extensive federal school system took place during this period, it is also true that both the Catholic and the Protestant missions had made very considerable and often successful efforts to educate Indians during the preceding fifty years and were themselves on the threshold of a new era of Indian education, facts which have been curiously overlooked.

J. B. TENNELLY

Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions

The Social Development of Canada. An Introductory Study with Select Documents. By S. D. CLARK, Lecturer in Sociology, University of Toronto. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1942. Pp. x, 484. $4.00.)

This is a pioneer work, and should receive the leniency of criticism to which compositions of that character are entitled. Of its 484 pages, some 122 are taken up by the author's introductions, and 349 by the illustrative

documents. These last are drawn from sources of every description—official archives, letters and personal papers, institutional reports and other publications, reminiscences, books of travel, diaries, immigration literature, newspapers, etc. The author spreads a wide net. The book has the credit of introducing the student to a very broad field of social literature.

The author's general introduction is an abstract essay presented with some sociological jargon. It may be neither very clear nor very interesting to the non-initiate. But the introductions to the several sections are mere concrete historical summaries, and the book on the whole proves to be somewhat elementary: it would be quite within the capacity of college freshmen, but the subject-matter, of course, calls for students of maturer development.

The titles of the chief divisions are: The Fur Trade and Rural Society in New France; The Fisheries and Rural Society in the Maritime Colonies; The Timber Trade and Rural Society in Upper Canada; Mining Society in British Columbia and the Yukon; Transcontinental Railways and Industrial-Capitalist Society. Great themes these, but it is hard to be reconciled to the serious gaps. The bed-rock of the Canadian nation is its farming population, but we hardly hear of it after the "clearing" and "barn-raising" days. A grim but impressive story is that of the Atlantic fishermen in the past seventy-five years; we get here only records of an earlier era. Likewise unnoticed is mining exploitation in central Canada during the present century. And one view predominates too much in the selection of the illustrative documents. The author is interested in the development of "controls", and gives us a plethora of materials on the conditions that called for controls. But the result has something of the effect of a police gazette. If Canadian pioneer life was not all beer and skittles, neither was it all sin and suffering. One of Canada's outstanding achievements in the field of social service is the child-welfare organization and legislation of the province of Ontario. It is represented here (p. 427) by a statement made in the early stages of the movement by Dr. W. L. Scott (who, the son of Sir Richard Scott, a prominent Catholic statesman of a preceding generation, has been himself a main leader in the great advance that has been made since 1909). Perhaps even more world-renowned is the combined adult-education and co-operative-economics movement in Nova Scotia, sponsored by St. Francis Xavier University. It is not represented in the present selections.

In the first section are many French documents in translation. The translation is usually fairly accurate, but often too great literalness drains away the significance. "Sauvage" is, as a general rule, translated "savage"; it should, as a general rule be rendered "Indian". In treating ecclesiastical phraseology the effect is sometimes more serious. A passage in a mandement by Bishop Laval condemning luxury in women's dress is rendered thus (p. 80):

"In this cause we prohibit very expressly all girls and women of whatever quality and fortune from approaching the Sacraments, presenting the consecrated bread, going to the offering and making the collection in the churches in the indecent manners that we have just specified."

The following will give a better idea of the meaning:

"For these reasons we forbid in the most positive terms all girls and women of whatever rank and fortune they may be from approaching the sacraments, distributing the blessed bread, taking part in the offertory, and taking up the collection in the churches in the indecent manner that we have just specified."

JAMES F. KENNEY

Public Archives of Canada

LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

Crusaders of the Río Grande. By J. MANUEL ESPINOSA. (Chicago: Institute of Jesuit History. 1942. Pp. xx, 410. $4.00.)

The present volume is most welcome, filling as it does a serious gap in our knowledge of New Mexico's interesting and exciting past. Of course, the general lines of the story of Don Diego de Vargas and the Reconquest are well enough known, but the fuller story in all its wealth of detail and color has too long lain hidden in the archives. These past few years Professor Espinosa has given us glimpses of this fuller story in a number of short articles appearing in various historical journals. Not quite two years ago his contribution to the Coronado Historical Series, the scholarly edition of the documents pertinent to the first Vargas expedition into New Mexico, brought further information. Now this authority on Vargas has gone beyond the limits of that 1693 expedition and neatly set down the whole story of the Reconquest, along with valuable information on the remaining years of Don Diego's career, carrying the New Mexican narrative to 1704 when the reconqueror passed from the scene.

A carefully planned Prologue sets the stage by reviewing in brief compass the early contacts of the white man with the region, the period of conquest and settlement under Oñate, the pre-1680 years, and, finally, the disastrous Pueblo revolt of the latter year. An equally well planned and executed Epilogue carries the New Mexican story forward from 1704. In between is a fast-moving and thrilling narrative, worthy of the tales of more familiar Spanish conquests in the New World. Last of the conquistadores though he be, Don Diego de Vargas hardly need bow to his more publicized predecessors. There is the same ability, the same courage, the same hardiness, the same crusading enthusiasm.

Several sections of the work deserve a particular word of notice and commendation. The author has not limited himself to chronicling the bare succession of events. In numerous instances he has taken pains to

emphasize institutional change and development. Enlightening notice is given to the evolution of the policies of Indian control from the earlier encomienda system of pre-1680 days into the mission-garrison combination, which in the seventeenth century was working quite successfully on other frontiers. This particular change has not always been recognized in the New Mexican story. Frequent sidelights on Franciscan mission history in the province are provided, thus increasing our fund of information concerning this splendid record of Christian achievement. The chapter on "Border Politics" is especially valuable, revealing as it does the often difficult character of border officials and citizens and showing the extent to which Spanish individualism and ambition might go toward thwarting both the cause of justice and that of efficient administration. Such a story as this gives many a clue as to why the best intentioned policies and institutions of the Spanish crown so frequently failed of deserved achievement in the far-off American provinces.

The work is distinctly worthwhile to the student of the Spanish Southwest. It is the product of careful and painstaking research in first-rate archival materials. This book is an excellent example of the fine use to which our growing American stock of microfilm and photostatic copies of foreign archives can be put.

JOHN F. BANNON

St. Louis University

Latin America and the Enlightenment. Edited by Arthur P. Whitaker. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co. 1942. Pp. xiii, 130. $1.25.)

The wave of interest in Latin America, its history, its peoples, and their culture has brought forth many books in recent years, most of them superficial, undigested, sentimentally sickening or revoltingly patronizing. But in the turbid stream of Latin American publications that has flooded the nation a few serious and informative studies are to be found. The present little volume deserves a prominent place among the latter. From the point of view of the development of culture and the course it followed in the Spanish colonies this collection of essays is of great significance and importance. Like its companion, the little volume of Professor Lanning on *Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies*, it will prove a powerful corrective to the erroneous but tenaciously held idea that there was no intellectual or cultural development in the vast dominions of Spain in America, that the colonial period in the history of our southern neighbors was an abysmal void in which their minds were consistently starved and deadened.

In six essays by as many authors, the impact of Enlightenment on Spanish America and the contribution, yes, contribution of Latin America

to the general movement are presented as an integral part of the intellectual awakening that shook the Old Regime throughout Europe and prepared the way for the French Revolution and the modern age. Professor Whitaker discusses "The Dual Role of Latin America in the Enlightenment", pointing out that the Spanish colonies were not the horrible example of all the evils which European exponents of the new movement delighted to denounce, and that contrary to the generally accepted opinion Spain and her colonies actually contributed significantly to the general movement. Hussey presents the "Traces of French Enlightenment in Colonial Hispanic America" and shows how widespread this influence was. Bernstein in his essay on "Some Inter-American Aspects of the Enlightenment" reminds the reader that the movement was one of "freshly born inter-American interest" and the intellectual understanding with Spanish America was sought as early as the close of the seventeenth century by no less a personage than Cotton Mather. Lanning gives a refreshing and new picture of "The Reception of the Enlightenment in Latin America," blasting the traditional conception of the furtive penetration of its liberal influence. Marchant contributes a remarkable account in his "Aspects of the Enlightenment in Brazil", showing the course it followed and how it differed from that of the rest of Spanish America. Professor Aiton, in the concluding essay, "The Spanish Government and the Enlightenment", analyzes the attitude of the Crown and its officials towards the movement and the ineffective efforts to check it when it was too late.

Taken together the six essays form an invaluable contribution far in excess of the size of the little volume. One is tempted to say that in the modern flood of Latin American publications the best things have more or less consistently come in "small packages." Professor Onis has contributed an excellent introduction in which he truthfully affirms that if "Europe showed a lack of understanding . . . in judging Spain and her history, these essays correct the errors of that interpretation." What we need for the permanent success of the good neighbor policy are more books of this sort that will correct long-standing misconceptions and bring about a genuine appreciation of Spanish American culture.

CARLOS E. CASTAÑEDA

University of Texas

Pichardo's Treatise on the Limits of Louisiana and Texas. Edited by Charles Wilson Hackett. Volume III. (Austin: University of Texas Press. 1941. Pp. xxii, 623. $6.50.)

This volume is a continuation of a work in which Professor Hackett presents in translation the first three-fourths of a treatise by Father José Antonio Pichardo in which the author attempts to prove that Texas was

not a part of the Louisiana Purchase of 1803. As head of an historical commission appointed by the Spanish government, Father Pichardo painstakingly compiled his treatise of 3,000 folio pages over a period of four years, commencing in 1808.

The translation by Professor Hackett represents a tremendous labor and the annotation is painstakingly done. Since the work is chiefly of interest to scholars, it is unfortunate, perhaps, that the effort expended in translation was not used to more advantage in a detailed and critical analysis of the original. It is obvious that if a work of such proportions were completely annotated, it would require several more volumes. Nevertheless, since the account is in no sense an impersonal narrative but has the avowed purpose of proving a thesis, the material requires close inspection and careful evaluation.

There is, for instance, no attempt by the editor to evaluate the authority for Pichardo's account of the DeSoto expedition, except to print, without comment, the very damaging opinion of T. H. Lewis (p. 5). No reason is deemed necessary for stressing the secondary source such as Garcilaso de la Vega in preference to the eyewitness accounts of the Gentleman of Elvas and DeSoto's secretary, Ranjel. It becomes rather difficult to share the editor's enthusiasm for Father Pichardo's use of documentary evidence in the development of his argumentative discussions or to consider it "superfluous to attempt to indicate the contributions—fundamental and conclusive—which he (Pichardo) makes" to the history of the French in Cibola, when the reader discovers on pp. 3, 14, and 290 that Father Charlevoix is cited by referring to an Italian translation of a French summary of the original. In his notes, the editor might well have mentioned the important Final Report of the United States DeSoto Expedition (Government Printing Office, 1939). The French side of the marriage of Derbanne in the Sandoval Case has been completely treated by Jean Delanglez, S.J., *The French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana, 1700-1763* (Washington, 1935).

PAUL LIETZ

Loyola University
Chicago

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Executive Office of the American Catholic Historical Association is at last able to announce the definite place and time of the twenty-third annual meeting of the Association. The meeting will be held in Columbus, Ohio on December 29, 30, and 31 with headquarters at The Neil House. The American Historical Association and the other historical societies will meet concurrently in the Ohio capital.

The Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress has recently acquired four boxes of letters of General William T. Sherman through the gift of Miss Eleanor Sherman Fitch, the general's granddaughter. The collection includes copies of leters written by the general during the days of his active campaigning in the field in the period 1862-1865. Likewise there are eighty letters from General Grant to Sherman during the Civil War and running on into Grant's presidency.

Sargent B. Child, National Director of the Historical Records Survey, reported the progress of the Survey's work to the meeting of the American Library Association at Milwaukee on June 23. In the period of six and a half years in which the project has been functioning there had been up to the date of Mr. Child's address a total of 1940 items published. For example, a total of 584 volumes have been published in the Inventory of Federal Archives, twenty-eight volumes in the Inventories of State Archives, and a total of 628 Inventories of County Archives. An increase of forty-three new guides, calendars, or lists in the Manuscript Program brought that division to a total of 107 items. Of special interest to readers of the REVIEW will be the increase of inventories and directories of Church Archives by 67 this past year, bringing to 164 volumes the total for the published items of this section of the Records Survey. A considerable number of these inventories and directories are of the Catholic Church in various dioceses. They will, of course, be of genuine use to the student of American church history, though there is a marked difference in quality among them.

Readers of the REVIEW will learn with regret that the church archives program of the Historical Records Survey of the Work Projects Administration was discontinued on July 1. This action was necessitated by the curtailment of the funds for this work. The office of the REVIEW received shortly before the work was discontinued several more volumes, notice of which will be of interest to students in American Church history. One of these volumes was *A Directory of Churches and Religions in Indiana*, Vol. III—Northern Indiana. Pt. 1. Adventist and Mennonite Bodies. A second volume is *Guide to Church Vital Statistics Records in North Dakota*.

Unfortunately in this case a good portion of the Catholic parishes in North Dakota report that no survey was made. A large volume is given to a *Directory of Churches and Religious Organizations in Minnesota,* which in the case of the Catholic Church, however, does not contain much more information than that found in the *Catholic Directory* for 1941. The most useful of these recent volumes to research workers in American Catholic history will be *A Directory of Catholic Churches in Wisconsin* sponsored by the University of Wisconsin and the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Professor Peter Leo Johnson of St. Francis Seminary writes the Foreword and emphasizes the fact that the source for places and dates is the *Catholic Almanac and Directory,* now rare and difficult to use. Professor Johnson remarks, "Besides other uses, the digest will provide the basis from which studies may be projected, particularly those related to the problems of Church distribution, population shifts and unchurched areas."

Recent publications of The National Archives include *The Role of the Archivist in Public Administration,* by Helen L. Chatfield, and *Old Records in a New War,* by Edward G. Campbell. The study of *Historical Units of Agencies of the First World War,* by Elizabeth B. Drewry, recently issued as a processed document, has been expanded and published as no. 4 of the *Bulletins* of The National Archives. Other processed documents recently issued include *The Protection of Federal Records Against Hazards of War* and *Archives and the War,* both by Collas G. Harris, and *Records Administration and the War,* by Emmet J. Leahy, reprinted from *Military Affairs.* Copies of these publications are available upon request from The National Archives.

Improved procedure for the disposal of useless Government records and new provisions for the transfer of important permanent records to The National Archives were discussed at a recent meeting of the National Archives Council. The Council, composed of the ten members of the Cabinet or their alternates, the Chairmen of the Library Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Librarian of Congress, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Archivist of the United States, was established by the National Archives Act of 1934. At the recent meeting of the Council, the Archivist of the United States was elected Chairman of the Council, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution was named Vice Chairman, and the Administrative Secretary of The National Archives was selected as Secretary. The present incumbents of these offices are: Dr. Solon J. Buck, Dr. C. G. Abbot, and Mr. Thad Page. In order to facilitate the transfer of valuable Federal records to The National Archives, the Council passed a resolution authorizing the Archivist to requisition for transfer: "I. Any archives or records that the head of the agency that has the custody of them may offer for transfer

to The National Archives. II. Any archives or records that have been in existence for more than fifty years unless the head of the agency that has custody of them certifies in writing to the Archivist that they must be retained in his custody for use in the conduct of the regular current business of the said agency. III. Any archives or records of any Federal agency that has gone out of existence unless its functions have been transferred to the agency that has the custody of the records."

Number 3 (August, 1942) of the first volume of Bulletins of the American Association for State and Local History is entitled, *Using Volunteers in the Local Historical Society's Program*. The author is Loring McMillen, Director of the Staten Island Historical Society.

Students working in the field of American Church history will be glad to know that the regular four numbers of the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia are to appear again. Due to unavoidable difficulties the series for 1939 and 1940 were not completed. The June 1941 issue, which appeared in July, carries a series of pictures of the Society's historic home on Spruce Street, an article on "Daniel Carroll, Framer of the Constitution," by Professor Richard J. Purcell, part of a doctoral dissertation of Sister Maria Alma, I.H.M. on "Foundation of Catholic Sisterhoods in the United States," and a reprint of the sermon delivered in St. Peter's Church, Baltimore, on February 22, 1800 by Bishop John Carroll commemorating the death of George Washington. The September, 1941 issue continues the articles by Dr. Purcell and Sister Maria Alma. Besides these, the number contains a paper on "The Evolution of St. Joseph's College [Philadelphia]" by Thomas J. Love, S. J.; remarks by His Eminence Cardinal Dougherty on "The Third Oldest Parish in Pennsylvania," made on the occasion of the bicentennial celebration of the Most Blessed Sacrament parish, Bally; and a partial list of the writings of the late Bishop Thomas J. Shahan.

The March-April issue of the St. Vincent College *Journal* carried an article by Felix Fellner, O.S.B. on "Phases of Catholicity in Western Pennsylvania during the Eighteenth Century." The article has now been reprinted by the Archabbey Press at Latrobe. To it have been added seven pages of notes citing sources for the story of Catholic beginnings in western Pennsylvania. Father Felix displays his usual careful workmanship in the article and gives evidence of considerable labor in the Cathedral Archives of Baltimore.

The Annals of the Polish Roman Catholic Union Archives and Museum (Vol. 7) is devoted to an article, "Washington and Kosciuszko" by Ladislaus M. Kozlowski. The author denies that the two men knew each other well. Mr. Kozlowski quotes the greater part of their correspondence, all of which was concerned with military matters and the good wishes exchanged between acquaintances.

The Burton Historical Collection of the Detroit Public Library has recently acquired a considerable addition to its material on Father Gabriel Richard in the form of microfilms of his letters for the years 1796-1826, originals of which are preserved in the Cathedral Archives of Baltimore. Likewise there has been received a photostat of his memorandum book for the years 1792-1806 which is in the Archives of the University of Notre Dame.

The Catholic Federation of Women's Clubs, Cleveland, has appointed a war historian in each of its hundred units. These historians will collect and classify information about Catholic war activities suitable for the writing of history tomorrow.

The study of contemporary America will, for a long time, be illuminated by the publications—Hearings, Monographs, and Final Reports—of the Temporary National Economic Committee. A valuable critique of the whole published record is available in a Supplement to the *American Economic Review* (Vol. XXXII, No. 2, Part 2) for June, 1942. Pertinent essays include, "The Extent and Bases of Monopoly," by George J. Stigler, "Price and Production Policies," by M. M. Baker, "Savings and Investment: Profits vs. Prosperity?" by Moses Abramovitz, and "Present Position and Prospects of Antitrust Policy," by Myron W. Watkins. Appendices include the message of President Roosevelt which led to the establishment of TNEC and, most conveniently, an itemized list of all the Committee's publications. The historian might be impressed by the fact that nowhere do the axioms of old-fashioned Political Economy seem to be so rare as in the sophisticated essays which make up this Supplement, just as the economists appear to have been impressed by the "culture lag" which was evident in the loose handling of the terms 'competition', and 'monopoly', before the Committee.

Connected in many ways with those issues brought up before the TNEC was the problem of defining the proper sphere and activity of that prime instrument of governmental regulation, the Administrative Commission. Twenty-three monographs in the *Annals* of The American Academy of Political and Social Science for May, 1942 provide a great deal of thoughtful comment.

Apparently the survey of United States history study in the colleges which was conducted by the New York *Times* (June 21, 1942) is producing some effect. At a conference of about fifty teachers of American history from twenty colleges and universities in California held at Stanford University in August it was recommended that every four-year college and university in the state include in its curriculum a required survey course of the history of the United States. The conference urged that every effort be made to secure adequate training for teachers of United States history

in secondary schools. It made plans to create a loose organization open to all teachers and writers in United States history in California colleges and universities.

Canadian history is very much richer for the labors of Abbé Ivanhoë Caron, Archivist of the Province of Quebec, who died October 1, 1941. In *Culture* for March, M. Antoine Roy has compiled a bibliography of his work and in *Le Bulletin des Recherches Historiques* of July, Laval Laurent, O.F.M., has published a list of his lesser works, his many brief but invaluable notes appearing in periodical literature. There are some duplicates, but each contains titles not listed in the other.

The lectures on the relations of French Canada and Britain given at Laval University early in 1941 by Abbé Arthur Maheux were published under the title *Ton Histoire Est Une Epopée*. Recently they were translated into English by Professor Richard M. Saunders of the University of Toronto and published under the auspices of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs (Ryerson Press, Toronto). Thus a larger audience is influenced by this endeavor to promote better feelings between the French and the English-speaking Canadians. Coincidently a *Bibliographie Analytique* of the writings of Abbé Maheux, limited to 250 copies, was compiled by Lucien Lortie.

The most recent issue of the *Report* of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association contains the usual description of the annual meeting held at London, Ontario, October 8-9, 1941 and the reports of the officers. Six papers each are published for the English and French sections. These were listed in the January issue of the REVIEW.

An Inter-American Seminar of Social Studies under the auspices of the National Catholic Welfare Council began its sessions in Washington on August 24. The general subject of the discussions was: The Americas and the Crisis of Civilization. A dozen or more prominent Mexican and South American scholars and a select group of authorities on social studies from this country attended the sessions. After a week in Washington the seminar moved to Detroit, Notre Dame, Chicago, and Buffalo. The formal papers read by the discussion leaders and the substance of the discussions will be published by the N. C. W. C.

Those interested in the Symposium held at the last convention of the American Historical Association on the question: Have the Americas a Common History? will find the papers there read printed in full in the *Canadian Historical Review* for June, 1942. Their titles are listed in our Periodical Literature.

Mid-America for July, 1942, continues the studies of sixteenth-century Jesuit activities in the colonization of Brazil which it inaugurated in its

January issue. The editor, Jerome V. Jacobsen, S.J. presents an illuminating paper on Manuel da Nobrega, S.J., director of religious foundations and social organization under three early governors (pp. 151-188). J. Manuel Espinosa has an informative study of Luiz da Gra, S.J., mission builder and educator (pp. 189-216).

The third number of *University of Miami Hispanic-American Studies* contains two articles of special interest to historians: "The Legal Theory of Forced Labor in the Spanish Colonies" by James J. Carney, Jr. and "El Pan-Hispanismo, el Panamericanismo, y la cooperación entre los países hispanoamericanos como tres filosofías de desarrollo internacional" by Robert E. McNicoll.

The papers read at the Conference on Latin-American Culture at the University of Texas on April 14 and 15 are published in a brochure entitled: *Cultural Bases of Hemispheric Understanding* (Institute of Latin-American Studies, The University of Texas, 1942. Pp. 94). The papers presented by the Latin-American scholars appear in both English and Spanish. Religion is all but completely omitted from the discussions.

Marygrove College, of Detroit, has issued a special publication on Latin-American history with the title of *A Spiritual Conquest: The Jesuit Reductions in Paraguay, 1610-1767* (Detroit, 1942). The institution is to be warmly congratulated on its undertaking. In a series of excellent papers, all written by students, the story of the Jesuits in colonial Paraguay is stirringly told. Very complete bibliographies are also given. Although the work adds nothing new to the professional historian's store of knowledge, *A Spiritual Conquest*, written with a charming simplicity, is to be recommended for the layman who wishes to familiarize himself with the subject treated. Copies of the brochure, at $1.50 each, may be purchased from the Newman Book Shop, Westminster, Maryland.

The *Archivio José Martí*, published by the Ministry of Education of Havana, of which Vol. II, No. 2 (December, 1941) has appeared, is devoted to the perpetuation of the memory of the great Cuban patriot.

A catalogue of the manuscripts which Salvador Cisneros Betancourt presented to the Academia de la Historia de Cuba of Havana is published in the latest volume of the *Anales de la Academia de la Historia de Cuba* (Tomo XXI, January-December 1939, Havana, 1942). Tomás Jústiz and René Lufríu are president and secretary, respectively, of the Academy.

The August number of *Christus*, Mexican ecclesiastical review, is devoted to the episcopal jubilee of Pope Pius XII. It contains a tribute to the Holy Father from Cardinal O'Connell and a review of his life by Archbishop Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate to the United States.

An article by Lewis Hanke, director of the Hispanic Foundation, the Library of Congress, appears in the February-March number of the *Revista de la Universidad Católica Bolivariana*, of Medellín, Colombia. Dr. Hanke wrote on the subject, "La controversia entre Las Casas y Sepúlveda en Valladolid".

The long-standing boundary dispute between Ecuador and Peru, which the recent Rio accord has apparently not settled to the satisfaction of the two nations concerned, boasts of an extensive bibliography. The most recent statements on the Ecuadorian side have appeared under the auspices of the Department of Press and Publications of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Quito (Julio Tobar Donoso, *Exposición del ministro de relaciones exteriores del Ecuador a las cancillerías de América*, 2nd ed., 1941; Carlos A. Vivanco, *El Ecuador en la Independencia de América* [*Refutación al Diputado peruano Doctor Carlos de la Puente*], 1941; and *Dictámenes jurídicos acerca del problema ecuatoriano-peruano dados por ilustres internacionalistas americanos*, 1942).

Nuestro Blason is the title of a new periodical published by the students of the Catholic University of Peru. The articles in the first issue (June, 1942) are of a thoroughly serious nature.

Father Rubén Vargas Ugarte, S.J., director of the Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas of the Catholic University of Peru, has been made a member of the Academia Peruana Correspondiente de la Real Española de la Lengua. In tribute to the well-known historian, the director of the Academia, Don José de la Riva-Agüero y Osma, has published a 74-page brochure containing Father Ugarte's reception address, *La elocuencia sagrada en el Perú en los siglos XVII y XVIII* (Lima, 1942).

A brief speech by Miguel Cruchaga Tocornal and a paper by Guillermo Feliú Cruz, in tribute to the late Agustín Edwards, sometime president of the Academia Chilena de la Historia, have been printed in Vol. XCIX, No. 44, third series, of the *Anales de la Universidad de Chile* (Santiago, 1941).

The death of Professor Luis Galdames, widely-known historian and dean of the Faculty of Philosophy and Education of the University of Chile, occurred on November 20, 1941.

The latest *Boletín* of the Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters of the University of Buenos Aires (Año XIX, Tomo XXV, July, 1940, to June, 1941, Nos. 85-88) contains articles by Miguel Solá ("Adición a 'La imprenta en Salta'"), José Torre Revello ("La memoria del primer gobierno de Mercado y Villacorta en Tucumán,

1655 a 1660"), León Baidaff ("La comisión de Bernardino Rivadavia en Europa y la prensa francesa, 1816-1820"), and Humberto A. Mandelli ("El estatuto provincial tucumano de 1852"). Sections are also devoted to documents, bibliographical guides and notices, general information, etc. It is perhaps not too much to say that the *Boletín*, which has long been edited by Dr. Emilio Ravignani, is the foremost historical journal of Latin America.

Carl Seidler's *Zehn Jahre in Brasilien während der Regierung Don Pedros und nach dessen Entthronung mit besonderer Hinsicht auf das Schicksal der ausländischen Truppen und der deutschen Colonisten* (Quedlinburg und Leipzig, 1835) has been translated into Portuguese by General Bertoldo Klinger and published by the Livraria Martins of São Paulo under the title of *Dez anos no Brasil* (1941). As Dr. Rubens Borba de Morais, director of the São Paulo Library, says in his brief preface, the work is "full of animosity toward the country that did not make him [Seidler] a millionnaire" (p. 5), but the reader, who can separate fact from feeling, will make room for the book in his bibliography of important nineteenth-century Brazilian travelogues.

The Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has published a useful guide to Brazil under the title of *Brasil 1940-41 relação das condições geográficas, econômicas e sociais* (Rio de Janeiro, 1941). Chapters are devoted to geography, history, immigration and colonization, the armed forces, foreign relations, education, labor legislation, social medicine, civil service, the national budget, agriculture, industry, foreign and coastwise commerce, finance, transportation, and communications.

In honor of the third centenary of the attempted acclamation of Amador Bueno de Ribeira as king of São Paulo, the Instituto Histórico e Geográfico of São Paulo has published a commemorative brochure, artistically printed, under the title of *O Instituto Histórico e Geográfico de São Paulo a Amador Bueno no tricentenário de sua aclamação como rei de São Paulo 1641-1941* (São Paulo, 1941). It may be well to recall that the event was connected with the accession of John IV to the throne of Portugal in 1640, when the sixty-year period of domination by the Spanish Hapsburgs was brought to a close. Bueno's refusal to accept the offer of the Spanish party in São Paulo made the allegiance of Portuguese America to the first sovereign of the Bragança line unanimous.

Dr. Dante de Laytano, director of the State Archives of Rio Grande do Sul and professor of history in the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters (Marist Fathers) of Pôrto Alegre, Brazil, is visiting the United States as a guest of the Department of State.

Edited by the National Library of Lisbon, the *Exposição Bibliográfica da Restauração Catálogo* (2 vols., Lisboa, 1941) is the most complete guide to printed works, including periodicals, on the restoration of the Portuguese monarchy in 1640. The volumes in question represent an important contribution on the part of the National Library to the national centennials of 1940.

João Ameal has prepared for the Secretariat of National Propaganda of Lisbon a short biography of the Blessed João de Brito (whose process of canonization is now reaching a happy end) under the title of *João de Brito herói da fé e do império* (Lisboa, 1941). Although the life of the seventeenth-century Jesuit martyr is written in an exalted patriotic vein, students of the expansion of Christianity in the Far East will read the little volume with pleasure.

In the March number of the excellent review, *Moçambique documentário trimestral*, published in Lourenço Marques by the government of Portuguese East Africa, Sacadura Bote edits an extract of the diary of the governor at Lourenço Marques, José de Almeida de Ávila, from June 15 to July 9, 1889. The text throws much light on the rescinding of the contract for the construction of the Transvaal railway, and may help to explain some of the difficulties which later involved Great Britain, Germany, and Portugal.

Belgian Congo at War, a richly illustrated booklet published by the Belgian Information Center (630 Fifth Avenue, New York City), contains an article on the Catholic missions in that country.

Virginia Boyd Goult has compiled *A Catalog of the Napoleon Library of De Paul University*.

Father Edward Hagemann, S.J., of Alma College, California, contributes an article to the June, 1942 issue of the *Pacific Historical Review* on the subject of "The Persecution of the Christians in Japan in the Middle of the Seventeenth Century." It was read as a paper at the meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association. This well-documented study analyzes the thorough methods pursued by the Japanese government to exterminate the Christians.

Carl F. Taensch of the Department of Agriculture contributes an article on "The Concept of Usury, the History of an Idea" to the June number of the *Journal of the History of Ideas*. The readers of this REVIEW will find it interesting, though they will doubtless not be in full agreement with its conclusions.

For those interested in Renaissance studies a useful instrument of research is the annual bibliography published in *Studies in Philology* (The University of North Carolina Press). The April, 1942 number lists 1552 items.

A striking cross-section of thirteenth-century intellectual and ecclesiastical history is to be found in "Some Aspects of the Career of Archbishop Pecham," by David Knowles, in the *English Historical Review*, LVII, Nos. 225 and 226. The Friar Minor who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1279 "displayed unusual readiness for controversies of every kind." He had participated in the mid-century quarrel between the secular clerks and the mendicants at Paris, and he showed himself no less ready to stir up controversy when he became primate of England. As a philosopher and theologian he was an opponent of the Thomists—in the sense that he was a traditionalist who thought too well of the accomplishments of the early middle ages in dealing with 'matter and form' to allow the rival Dominicans to claim any settlement of the problem—and he pushed his authority into Oxford to denounce Averroistic tendencies, and, by a forced implication, to forbid the teaching of 'unity of form'. Pecham stirred up his province further with organizational and economic reforms, pursued energetically in personal visitations even into Wales, where he played grand politics in profound disregard of King Edward. This was the last administration of Canterbury by one "whose reputation was as great or greater abroad than in England," whose Hildebrandine tendencies illustrated the independence and reforming competence of the mediaeval Church. As he had been appointed after the refusal of the king's nominee he was the last also to be a personal choice of the pope, until the naming of Cardinal Pole in the sixteenth century.

The *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* for July concludes its bibliography of works published since 1925 on Ancient Egypt. Headings of special interest are: Christianity in Egypt, Monasteries, Jews in Egypt, and Coptic Biblical Literature, Liturgies, and Saints' Lives.

The 450th anniversary of the discovery of America by Columbus falls this month.

This year marks the fourth centenary of the birth of St. John of the Cross. E. Allison Peers writes a brief appreciation of the great mystic in the July 4 issue of the *Tablet*.

Villanova College celebrated its 100th anniversary on September 20. It is the oldest Catholic college in Pennsylvania.

The silver jubilee of the episcopacy of the Most Reverend Joseph R. Crimont, S.J., was celebrated in St. James Cathedral, Seattle, on July 29. Bishop Crimont has had a very fruitful career during the many years of his missionary labors in Alaska. He has been a member of the American Catholic Historical Association since 1926.

Monsignor Joseph M. Gleason of St. Francis de Sales Church, Oakland, California, celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination on September 27. Monsignor Gleason is an ardent supporter of higher education. In the course of his lifetime he has amassed a magnificent historical library which he presented to San Francisco College for Women. The Catholic University of America conferred an honorary LL.D. upon him this year. The Monsignor is a life member of the American Catholic Historical Association.

Father Edward A. Ryan, S.J., of Woodstock College, has written an interesting brochure, *Historical Sketch of Saint Aloysius' Parish, Littlestown, Pennsylvania, 1791-1942*. Littlestown was founded as a mission from Conewago and served, almost entirely, by the Jesuits down to 1884.

Monsignor Patrick J. McCormick, Acting Rector of the Catholic University of America, received an honorary doctor's degree from the Catholic University of Chile. It was presented to him by Monsignor Vives, Vice Rector of the Chilean University, at the time of his visit in the United States.

John LaFarge, S.J., writer and educator, has been appointed to the newly-created office of Executive Editor on the staff of the Jesuit magazine, *America*.

Eugene W. Shiels, S.J., of Loyola University, Chicago, has been assigned to the editorial staff of *America*. Father Shiels is a specialist in Latin-American history. His paper, "Church and State in the First Decade of Mexican Independence," read at the December meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, was published in our July issue. The REVIEW wishes him success in his new field of labor.

Father Vincent J. Flynn of the College of St. Thomas has been awarded a Guggenheim fellowship for the coming year to prepare for publication an important manuscript of the second half of the fifteenth century on Anglo-Italian relations.

Professor Eoin MacNeill retired from the chair of early Irish history in University College, Dublin, in the autumn of 1941, a position which he had occupied since its establishment in 1908. The distinguished scholar was succeeded by the Reverend John Ryan, S.J., author of the fine work on *Irish Monasticism*.

Death claimed a distinguished Catholic historian on July 7 with the passing of Thomas F. Meehan. Mr. Meehan was 87 years of age at the time of his death. His work in history was identified chiefly with the United States Catholic Historical Society, of which he had been a member for over forty-three years. He had been since the death of Charles G. Herbermann in 1916 the editor of the Society's *Historical Records and Studies*, which with the issue for 1941 reached its thirty-second volume.

He also supervised the publication of the splendid series of Monographs of the same Society. He edited a facsimile reproduction of the first book published in America, the *Doctrina Breve*, first published at Mexico City in 1554, was an associate editor of the five volumes entitled, *Catholic Builders of the Nation*, published in 1923, and for three years, 1906-1909, was on the editorial staff of the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, to which he contributed over a hundred articles. In recognition of his outstanding merits Pope Pius XI conferred upon him knighthood in the Order of St. Gregory in April, 1931, and at the centenary of Fordham University in 1941 he received the honorary degree of Doctor of Letters. He was educated at St. Francis College, Brooklyn, where he took the A.B. and A.M. degrees in 1873 and 1874 respectively. Mr. Meehan's kindly nature endeared him to all who had occasion to meet and work with him. The funeral Mass at the Church of the Queen of All Saints was offered by Father Francis X. Talbot, S.J., editor of *America*, with which Mr. Meehan had been prominently associated during his last years. Father Talbot pays a tribute to the deceased scholar in the July 18 issue of *America*.

The greatest authority on the life of St. Thomas More, Professor Robert W. Chambers of University College, London, died on April 23. He published his *Thomas More* (New York, 1935) only after more than thirty years of study of the great statesman. It was at once recognized by scholars as a definitive work.

Guglielmo Ferrero, the internationally known Italian historian, died in exile in Geneva, Switzerland, on August 4.

The Reverend Michael O'Flanagan, 66, Irish historian and Vice President of the Sinn Fein, died on August 7.

Documents: Letters and Reports passing between the Commanders at Apalache (St. Marks), Governor Grant at St. Augustine, General Haldiman at Pensacola, and General Gage, Commander-in-Chief at New York, 1767-1769. Mark F. Boyd (*Florida Histor. Quarterly*, July).—Unpublished American Documents on the Naval Battle of Lissa (1866). Howard R. Marraro (*Journal of Modern Hist.*, Sept.).—Correspondence Parkman-Casgrain [fin]. Arthur Maheux (*Le Canada Français*, June).—Bishop Henni's Correspondence to the Ludwigmissionsverein, Munich. (*Salesianum*, July).—Christian Traugott Ficker's Advice to Emigrants. Part III. (*Wisconsin Mag. of Hist.*, June).—Diary of Colonel Isaac N. and Mrs. Emily Ebey, 1856-1857). L. A. Kibbe (*Pacific Northwest Quart.*, July).—A Statement by Phelipe de Neve [on the California Missions]. Ruth Lapham Butler (*Hispanic American Histor. Rev.*, May).—Extracts from the Diary of Don Pedro II. Mary Wilhelmine Williams (*Hispanic American Histor. Rev.*, Aug.).—Materials Relating to Brazil in the National Archives. (*ibid.*).

BRIEF NOTICES

ADAMS, EUGENE T., et al. *The American Idea.* (New York: Harper and Bros. 1942. Pp. 278. $1.75.) The aim of this volume, the work of nine different writers, is to show the relation of American achievements in government, economy, science, art, literature, education, religion, and philosophy to the democratic American background.

The achievements of Americans in these fields are said to have been determined largely by a realistic, individualistic, and democratic spirit. America, as a young nation, had little time to devote to pure science but led the world in the invention of machines. At the present time she leads the world in both applied and pure science. With democratic principles she has, for example, provided the world's highest proportion of medical practitioners to care for the health of her people. American painting has been realistic and individualistic, and largely devoted to native scenes. In the field of literature, faith in democracy has been the chief concern of her poets, dramatists, and novelists.

In the discusssion of American religion, the author points out that American experience has brought about the conviction that "the best way of reaching true religious beliefs and valid religious practices is the method of give-and-take . . . Americans have come to believe that truth is not so much conformity to past dogma as it is those beliefs that have the power of working out in actual practice and of getting themselves accepted in the market of ideas" (p. 209).

Pragmatism is described as a product of American culture, a philosophy which reflects the American temperament better than any other. It is indigenous, for it illustrates the American interest in things practical, it defends the principle of human freedom and is essentially democratic in its general outlook (p. 233). (DORA J. GUNDERSON)

BRYSON, LYMAN AND LOUIS FINKELSTEIN (Eds.) *Science, Philosophy, and Religion.* (New York: Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion in their Relation to the Democratic Way of Life, Inc., 3080 Broadway. 1942. Pp. xi, 599. $3.00.) This large volume is the report on the second conference of scientists, philosophers, and theologians which began in New York in the fall of 1940 and which has for its purpose the contributions which the three great mental disciplines can make for the strengthening of the democratic cause in a challenging world. Almost every conceivable viewpoint is expressed by leaders in each of the fields. Yet far apart as are those attitudes, there is nevertheless an absolutely united front of every speaker and commentator against the evils of facism and all its works and pomps in favor of democracy as a common denominator. Their common aim is to implement their abstract thought in the service of democracy as they see it from their various vantage points. The very fact that democracy can sum-

mon to its support the whole gamut of human thinking as it here passes before the mind's eye in its multitude of nuances is itself a heartening and inspiring spectacle. Incidentally the philosophers and theologians seem more sure of themselves in this symposium than they did in the first meeting, thanks to the notable attack of Professor Mortimer Adler of the University of Chicago upon the assumption that these disciplines are capable only of opinion and never arrive at certitude. The scholastic viewpoint is represented by three essays: Professor Yves Simon's "Thomism and Democracy", Professor O'Meara's "Philosophical Foundations of Religion and Democracy", and Father Gerald Phelan's "Philosophical Implications of the Prevalent Conception of Democracy." All are outstanding in the whole volume for their clarity, definiteness, and sense of getting somewhere.

The volume is not easy reading. Abstract thought at work never entices the running peruser. Yet this latter party is the maker of democracy's shibboleth and Robert Louis Stevenson has reminded us that man lives not by bread alone but principally by catchwords. Where is the genius who will snatch this fire from Olympus to enkindle the common man? (CHARLES A. HART)

BURT, ALFRED LEROY. *A Short Story of Canada for Americans.* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1942. Pp. xvi, 279. $3.00; text edition, $2.50.) The present volume is a welcome addition to the ever-increasing library of competent books on our sister states in the Western Hemisphere. Professor Burt adds his voice to the growing demand that we Americans throw off our false superiority complex and big-brother role and recognize that our little North and South American brothers are now of age and wish to be treated as such. Gradually the American public is being shown that the French and Spaniards have played a major role in the opening of the New World, and should have a greater share in the history of the United States than prejudiced (or ignorant?) historians of the past have been wont to admit.

Professor Burt has done an admirable job in debunking many American misconceptions of the French colonial period. He sums up the different religious motives behind the early colonization of these two countries: "These Englishmen came to save their own souls; the French came to save the souls of others . . . The Puritan immigrants, a wit once said, first fell on their knees and then on the aborigines, but the French embraced the Indians and sought to make them brothers, Christian and civilized." He shows that the *habitant* was not a feudal serf but quite as free, intelligent, and happy an individual as his American contemporary. And finally, he reminds the American middle westerner of his indebtedness to La Salle, Hennepin, Marquette, and hundreds of French settlers and *coureurs de bois,* who explored and left their mark on the whole Mississippi valley.

The author gives a good account of the opening up of the Canadian west and the gradual entry of the present provinces into the Union. In discussing the main characteristics of the government, he stresses the similarities and differences between Canada and the United States, and certain aspects in which our northern neighbor seems to be superior to us.

There are a few points on which the reviewer wishes to take issue with the author. His statement of the public and separate school question is vague, if not misleading. While Catholics seem to be treated fairly in most provinces, they do not receive their just share of the taxes for the support of their schools in Manitoba, Ontario, and British Columbia. Again, he sees no reason for American opposition to the Quebec Act which extended Canada to include the country north of the Ohio, and he quotes an often overlooked clause. The quotation does not settle the question. The land could not go to Quebec and still be recognized as belonging to several American colonies as part of their charters of land from sea to sea. (WILLIAM E. O'DONNELL)

Mathew Carey. Autobiography. Research Classics No. 1. (Brooklyn: Eugene L. Schwaab, 3124 Avenue J. 1942. Pp. ix, 134. $3.50.) This little volume is a lithographed edition of the autobiography of the famous Philadelphia publisher and bookman. The original edition appeared in the *New England Magazine,* V-VII (July, 1833-December, 1834) in the form of a series of letters to the editor. It was discontinued in 1835, but two years later a few copies were issued privately, to which three supplementary letters had been added. It is the latter edition which has furnished the copy for the present lithographed edition.

The thirty-three letters cover a variety of events from the birth of Carey in Ireland and his youthful escapades into the troubled political stream there to the series of letters which conclude the autobiography and which are devoted to an explanation of Carey's efforts for a protective tariff. The letters were written between October 4, 1833 and October 21, 1837. The two dominant subjects discussesd are Carey's activity in behalf of Catholic relief in Ireland and his work in regard to the tariff measures before Congress in the years after the War of 1812. The historian of the Catholic Church will be disappointed when he seeks information on the Church from a man who played a prominent role in its development in Philadelphia during a critical period. There is but one minor reference to Catholic activities in Philadelphia and that is concerned with the fact that the majority of the congregation of St. Mary's parish were Federalists around 1796 (p. 40). The historiographer will be interested in Carey's critical analysis of some of the leading histories of Ireland such as Clarendon, Temple, etc., in which he proved their bias (pp. 58-81). The original review of the autobiography written by Edgar Allen Poe in the *Southern Literary Magazine,* II, 203-204 (March, 1836) is reprinted. It is of real worth to have this little book on an important Catholic figure of the early years of the nineteenth century, although its price may militate against a very wide distribution of it. (JOHN TRACY ELLIS)

CHINARD, GILBERT (Ed.) *Souvenirs de Édouard de Mondésir.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Presss. 1942. Pp. 60. $1.50.) The publication of this little volume of extracts from the memoirs of one of the early French priests in the United States is a welcome addition to our slender literature on the American Church as viewed by foreign visitors. Mr. Chinard provides a good introduction which tells the story of the circumstances which brought the work into being. It was written by the Abbé de Mondésir in 1842 at the

request of Father Faillon, S.S., who was gathering material for a life of Father Emery. Mondésir was one of the seminarians who came with the first Sulpicians to Baltimore in July, 1791. He was ordained in Baltimore, taught at Georgetown College, and served for two years as secretary to Bishop Carroll.

The editor has selected parts of the original manuscript which would be, of general interest, such as Mondésir's reflections on Emery, on Chateaubriand who was a fellow passenger with the original Sulpician group in 1791, and on the Church as he observed it in Canada, Pennsylvania, and Baltimore. The church historian will find considerable of value here, and it is reassuring to be told by the editor that nothing of genuine historical interest has been omitted. *The Voice* of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore published an English translation of a good part of the manuscript in its issues of October and November, 1931. The little book is attractively printed as are all the publications of the Institut Français de Washington. (JOHN TRACY ELLIS)

DOUGLAS, DAVID C. *English Scholars.* (London: Jonathan Cape. 1939. Pp. 381. 15s.) The work deals with English mediaevalists between the years 1660-1730. Professor Douglas has produced a fascinating volume on the scholars whom one could call the Maurists of England. He groups them according to their field of research staking his way with the great names but offering a clearly developed picture of the learned world from which they sprang. He touches on the library facilities of the time and the favorable attitude toward historical research displayed by the Anglican clergy, the aristocracy, and the politicians. The zeal of lawyers and especially doctors for the study of history was conspicuous; that of professors of history was not. He analyses the motives that prompted the different groups and individuals to take interest in England's past. With measured enthusiasm he weighs the merits and demerits of his scholars. It is surprising how much of their work withstands even the test of modern criticism. His account is enlivened with occasional anecdotes and pungent comments of contemporaries; he likes to describe and criticize in the phrases and sentences of the period.

The list of scholars begins with Dugdale, great, despite the fact that he did not scruple to put his name to work that had been mainly done by others. Four chapters are devoted to Anglo-Saxon studies, philological and historical, culminating in George Hickes and Humphrey Wanley. The former was as much at home in the Greek and Latin Fathers as in Old English. The latter, friend of Samuel Pepys, like him a diarist, and as little squeamish in morals, was privileged to be librarian of the Harleian Collection. He was a masterly palaeographer and cataloguer. In six other chapters there pass in review: Robert Brady, physician, who became Keeper of Records at the Tower and wrote objectively on Anglo-Norman history to offset the Saxonists; short-lived Henry Wharton, apologist of Anglicanism, who put together the chronicles of the churches in England in his *Anglia Sacra;* Tanner and his *De scriptoribus;* eccentric Thomas Hearne, debarred from the libraries as a Non-juror, who nevertheless edited many of the important sources of the English middle ages; the Prussian Wilke, better known as Wilkins, who be-

came an Anglican archdeacon and edited the *Concilia;* Rymer, Historiographer Royal, who in almost abject poverty edited his fifteen volumes of *Foedera;* finally, greatest of them all, Madox, expert in diplomatics, whose *Formulare Anglicanum* and *Exchequer* were edited with the acumen of present-day criticism.

The paper, printing, and binding are superb. The book is for anyone interested in mediaeval or seventeenth-century England. (ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER)

G. S., *The Dignity of Kingship Asserted.* From the Edition of 1660 with an Introduction by William R. Parker. Facsimile Text Society, No. 54. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1942. Pp. xxi, 248. $2.20.) In editing this little book Professor Parker has made another contribution to our knowledge of Milton's contemporary reputation. *The Dignity* is a verbose answer to Milton's *The Readie and Easie Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth,* and it repeats a good many of the ordinary arguments in favor of monarchy and against republican government, but its main interest lies in the author's attitude toward his contemporaries rather than in its significance in the history of political theory. The two hundred and forty odd pages were written in less than three weeks, and it was registered for publication on March 31, 1660, but this time-serving effort to achieve recognition by attacking Milton's stubborn attempt to stem the inevitable seems to have been of no avail. A year later the publisher tried to clear his shelves by issuing it with a new title page. Professor Parker was fortunate in finding a contemporary and unfavorable reaction to the book written on the flyleaf of the Library of Congress copy of this second issue. The author's attitude toward Milton is one of respectful hostility, that of a consciously small man attacking a colossus. Who the author was remains somewhat uncertain, but Professor Parker makes out a highly probably case for George Starkey, physician, Harvard graduate of 1646, minor controversialist, and (significantly his only identifiable stylistic trait) "orator." Unlike many editions, Professor Parker's judicious introduction is considerably more interesting than the work itself. (KERBY NEILL)

GILLARD, JOHN J. *Colored Catholics in the United States.* (Baltimore: Josephite Press. 1941. Pp. x, 298. $3.00.) The content of the last work of the late Father Gillard is accurately described in the subtitle, "An investigation of Catholic activity in behalf of the Negroes in the United States and a survey of the present condition of the Colored Missions." The book gives a comprehensive picture of Catholicism among American Negroes, the causes which have aided or retarded its progress, and the various agencies which are now at work among colored Catholics.

The historian will find many items of interest to his special field scattered through Father Gillard's book. How many Catholics, for example, realize that the diocese of Portland had a Negro bishop from 1875 to 1900, or that in 1873 a Negro was appointed president of an important Catholic university? There is a well-documented survey of the rise of Catholicism among American Negroes and of the historical background of the work of the Church among the colored population.

Much of the material is presented in the form of lists and tables or in disjointed paragraphs under separate headings. While this makes the book less easy reading, it increases its value as a reference work—which was probably the author's intention. An excellent index and a very logical presentation of the matter further the same end. The historian or the sociologist who wants material on the American Catholic Negro in convenient form will be wise to have this book on his shelf. (PAUL HANLY FURFEY)

GUÈRARD, ALBERT. *The France of Tomorrow.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1942. Pp. xxi, 287. $3.50.) According to the author we cannot speak of "France" today, for France as a unity is no more. There are at least four Frances, each believing itself deeply rooted in the past, each striving for the control of the future. The first is Vichy France, which stands candidly for two things: isolation and reaction. The second France is Laval France, which believes in European co-operation under German leadership. The third France is the France of yesterday, the bourgeois democratic republic under which the avowed followers of the Petain and Laval ideologies were annoying, but helpless minorities. There is a fourth France, which is not an era, and not a regime. That France is Catholic, in the full sense of the term. It is the France of the Crusades, the France of the classical ideal, the France of the Enlightenment, the France of the Revolution and the Rights of Man, the France of the Romantic Humanitarians. This France alone would be able to assume a leading part in the building of a happier order.

It is the conviction of the author that there is no hope for the France of tomorrow, except in the free and united Europe of tomorrow. He is of opinion that the world-wide struggle now going on must be looked upon as a civil war. Consequently, when the war ends, there should be no treaty of peace. Instead of an armistice commission, there should be a provisional government; instead of a peace conference, a constituent assembly; instead of reparations, a Pan-European reconstruction plan; instead of minority rights, the guarantee of freedom for all, in every field, everywhere. The author insists that the way of salvation is to divorce territorial administration from cultural tradition. He does not advocate the balkanization of Europe, the setting up of sixty little countries, each fiercely independent between bristling boundaries. The disruption of Europe into its smaller ethnic, linguistic, or historical units, seems to him advisable only as a step toward European federation. According to him a United Europe in which the nations as such disappear, within a world state with a healthy regionalism is a necesssity. "Unite, or fight for ever", is the only alternative he can conceive.

To the "clever realists of the supercilious elite" who denounce and deride the solution of the problem suggested by him as a utopia, he answers: "Everything achieved by human intelligence and human will, must first be a utopia", words which remind us of the motto given by Count Coudenhove-Kalergi to his famous work, *Paneuropa* (1923): "Every great historical event began as a utopia, and ended as a reality." (HENRY JOSEPH BRUEHL)

HOLMES, FRED L. *The Voice of Trappist Silence.* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1941. Pp. xi, 114. $2.50.) After turning out excellent studies on Washington and Lincoln and the State of Wisconsin, Mr. Holmes now takes us with him into the mysterious inner sanctum of Trappist monasteries and lets us share for a time, though vicariously, the life of the little-known Trappist monk. His book reflects his own profound interest in what is to most men a strange way of life, and every page of it drives home his fixed conviction that Trappist silence is calling loudly to a maddened world its much needed lessons—if the world has but ears to hear.

In sixty pages of text, abundantly and attractively illustrated, the author gives us a quick but thorough survey of Trappist ideals and organization and a photographic close-up of what a Trappist does with all his days and nights. He takes the reader with him on a personally conducted tour of inspection. The reader will soon find that he is in the hands of an expert guide, who knows his way around and who tells honestly what he knows. Mr. Holmes shows us the Trappist going through his daily routine: arising early from his short sleep on a very uncomfortable cot, attending divine services in chapel, making his hours of meditation and spiritual reading, working in the fields or in the shops, taking his scant and meatless meals, and resting silently from his labors. Like all tourists, the reader of this book will be assured a delightful time with not a dull moment on the way.

Although the author seems to have fallen in love with Trappist monks and their manner of life, he gives the reader fair warning that this is the life for but a very small number of elite souls. Approximately nine out of every ten who try it out find the going a little too stiff and sooner or later leave for other havens.

Since the author is not an ecclesiastic with a background of theology and canon law, the surprising factor is not that he has made mistakes but rather that the mistakes are so few and for general purposes of no great import. For instance, he evidently confuses two things, to wit, the entrance into the novitiate and the taking of the habit with the taking of simple vows (p. 21). As a matter of fact, the Church does not permit the taking of any vows until after the novitiate has been completed. Again he gives the impression that in the ordination service to the priesthood it is the abbot who presides with the bishop merely assisting (p. 28). Of course, the abbot merely presents the candidates, whereas it is the bishop who alone consecrates them priests.

The author is not satisfied with just having shown us through a Trappist monastery. He will not let us depart without first pointing out some of the important lessons which the life of a Trappist monk with his vows of poverty, obedience, and chastity together with enduring silence hold out to those living in the world. To laymen and clerics and religious alike he proves that at least some small portion of Trappist silence is on the "must" list, if they are to find and "make" their own souls. (A. VIÉBAN)

HYMA, ALBERT. *The Dutch in The Far East. A History of the Dutch Commercial and Colonial Empire.* (Ann Arbor: George Wahr, Publisher. 1942. Pp. vii, 249. $1.75.) This small volume of 250 pages is divided into eight chapters and is provided with an Index, an Introduction, and what is

called "Bibliographical Annotations". As an outline, along a more or less definitely Dutch presentation of the facts, the book will be of interest in giving to the reading public the development of the Dutch East Indian colonies.

There is a certain sketchiness throughout the volume, leaving a sense that certain problems have not been adequately presented. Naturally Dutch policy in the main originated from the requirements of Holland in Europe. Consequently in the period from 1672 to 1815, Holland had to change her alliances, which gives to the superficial reader the idea of certain unsteadiness in Dutch policy. Holland was embroiled eight times during this period of 143 years in European wars during which she was twice the ally of France, and six times opposed to that country. Similarly there was co-operation with Britain and then war with Britain.

After the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, both Spain and Portugal as maritime powers declined and provided the opportunity for both Holland and Britain to compete in the East Indian trade. Thus a fortunate British sea victory opened a trade opportunity for the two countries; again after the battles of Aboukir Bay and Trafalgar, there was left in Europe only one naval force, and naturally trade began to pass to those who could protect it from the east to Europe. As this protection grew, the carrying trade passed to British mercantile fleets trading to India and China, the effects of which are still to be read in the figures which the Dutch government itself gave in noting the shipping tonnage entering and leaving Dutch East Indian ports. The total number of sailing and steam vessels for the years 1934-1936 was 40,783, of which 24,626 sailed under the British flag, indicating on what sources the carrying trade as late as 1936 was depending. The fact of such dependence is not presented fully to the reader. In spite of such omissions the book is pleasantly written and has many facts of historic interest for the non-research reader. (Boyd Carpenter)

Kelsen, Hans. *Law and Peace in International Relations.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1942. Pp. xi, 181. $2.00.) Students of sociology, of administrative techniques, and of legal history alike will share interest in this book with students of international affairs. Speaking as Oliver Wendell Holmes lecturer, Dr. Kelsen approaches the problem of international law from the technical and sociological point of view associated with Harvard. Two primary questions engross his attention: whether international law is true law, the outline of an order for the promotion of peace, and how it can be made a workable order to this end. In answering the first question in the affirmative, he defines law as a coercive order which balances the force of delict with the force of sanction, applied by an individual as the agent of the community. He quarrels with and rejects the theories of sovereignty of followers of the Austinian school of law. He considers them guilty of verbal dualism, in separating the state from the law, whereas it is in reality the order inherent in the law. He believes that they must logically deny the legal character of international law, even as positive morality. After comparing the theory of a just war with the development of criminal law in primitive society, he concludes that in its present stage, international law

is the primitive and incomplete law of a nascent international community. He carefully distinguishes law as a sociological process from the moral or ethical aims to which it is directed, and makes a minute analysis of the technical processes by which international law obligates individuals within states.

There is an interesting and valuable discussion of the logical contradictions in the structure of the League of Nations. In this connection it may seem that Dr. Kelsen dismisses rather summarily the administrative achievements of the League on the voluntary level; they may by many be regarded as evidence of embryonic administrative law. Inasmuch as they are not covered within his definition of coercive order, his omission is consistent with his thesis. (ELIZABETH M. LYNSKEY)

KERR, HUGH THOMPSON. *Preaching in the Early Church.* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1942. Pp. 238. $2.50.) *Preaching in the Early Church* is a book made up of lectures delivered before the faculty, student body, and friends of the San Francisco Theological Seminary. They constitute the second of a series of lectures given under the T. Verner Moore Foundation. It traces the history of preaching from New Testament times to the death of St. Augustine. In six chapters the history of preaching is studied from the writings of the Apostles, the Apostolic Fathers, the Greek and Latin Apologists, and the great Greek and Latin preachers. In handling this subject, the author has sought to find a middle ground between the art and content of the preaching of the various periods. The treatment is not exhaustive. What is intended is to point out by way of emphasis the path the preaching of that age took.

The author makes no claim to the scholarship necessary to perform this task with full competency. He claims the interest of an intellectually minded pastor and preacher. Nevertheless, he has neatly analyzed the preaching of the various ages and shown, under general headings, what were the characteristic marks of the preaching peculiar to the various periods treated. However, there is much more in this book than matter pertaining solely to preaching in the early Church. The main subject is often lost because the work is surcharged with digressions on various topics and on moralizations regarding present world conditions. These may have been in place for the audience before which the lectures were delivered but the printed book should envision a more general audience and be limited to the subject.

Certain opinions in the volume call for passing comment. It is an unwarranted statement to say that the long mediaeval period that followed Augustine reveals an almost total eclipse of preaching (p. 54). It is contrary to Christian tradition to state that martyrdom has no cleansing value (p. 61). Over-emphasis seems to be laid on the doctrine of the "priesthood of the believers", thereby undermining or denying the true sacerdotal nature of the Church (pp. 82, 203). Finally, St. Augustine's theology on grace is not to be identified with Calvinism (p. 214). (ALFRED C. RUSH)

PROUTY, C. T. *George Gascoigne: Elizabethan Courtier, Soldier and Poet.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1942. Pp. xii, 351. $3.75.) Seldom does a work on an Elizabethan author contain so much new material as the present study of George Gascoigne. Professor Prouty has attempted both a biography of the poet and a critical appraisal of his writings, and in this twofold attempt he is eminently successful and satisfying. The first four chapters of the book tell the story of the poet's life, and it is here that the author's seven years of careful research and patient examination of public documents have proved themselves to have been indeed years of plenty.

Gascoigne's questionable business dealings necessitating his frequent appearances in the lawcourts have furnished Professor Prouty with an abundance of sources from which to derive many new biographical data. Not the least of the contributions made by this study is the settling of some hitherto disputed points in the chronology of Gascoigne's life, e. g., his first appearance in court life in approximately the year of Elizabeth's accession to the throne, and his departure for the Dutch war in 1572. The character of Sir John Gascoigne, the poet's father, is more fully revealed by a number of new discoveries.

The last four chapters are devoted to a critical appreciation of the subject matter and the literary form of Gascoigne's writings. In the chapter on "The Court Poet", Professor Prouty gives a particularly fresh and stimulating analysis of the various concepts of love to be found in Gascoigne's early love poems.

Four of the six appendices discuss some special difficulties in Gascoigne's biography. There is a selected bibliography of the works quoted, and the index is completely satisfactory. One need not be a prophet to predict that Professor Prouty's scholarly study will remain for many years to come the authoritative work on Gascoigne. (GEORGE L. KANE)

PURYEAR, VERNON JOHN. *France and the Levant from the Bourbon Restoration to the Peace of Kutiah.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1941. Pp. xvi, 252. $2.50.) Vernon Puryear's carefully documented account of heretofore unexplored aspects of French policy in the Near East appears under the able editorship of Professors Bolton, Guttridge, and Paxson. The study under review represents a vast amount of toil in the archives of all pertinent countries, Russia alone excepted. But in this case other significant documents supply the deficit and enrich the entire scope of the research.

It is the author's contention that the Levantine policy of France after the fall of Napoleon represented not so much a new point of departure as a reassertion of her traditional historic influence in that ancient area of interest, where, for a time, England had achieved ascendancy. France desired to recapture her long lost prestige. Mr. Puryear, as well as Henri Hauser, who wrote the Introduction, claims that France's aim was not directly or immediately imperialistic in the generally accepted meaning of that term. True, there was a revived commercialism, leading to empire: Algeria was ultimately acquired. Meanwhile, the diplomat had prepared the way for

the trader, as the French government pursued its policy of essential continuity with the Levantine past. This policy was deemed vital if the tricolor were to wave over what might be rightly called a Great Power.

In addition to tracing the steps by which the new empire was rising in Algeria, the author devotes much attention to the intricate and somewhat elusive subject of Franco-Egyptian relations. This was a reversal of policy, involving as it did a shift from France's former preoccupation with Turkey. With only brief interruption, amicable relations continued with Egypt, which in time acquired Syria. The volume closes with the rise of the new Mohammedan empire centering in Cairo. Vernon Puryear's concern is with the economic and diplomatic aspects of the contact. In this meeting of a Christian and a Moslem culture, a student of social phenomena would likewise find a tempting field for historical research. (GEORGIANA P. MCENTEE)

REINEHR, SISTER MARY JOAN, O.S.F., Ph.D. *The Writings of Wilfred Scawen Blunt.* (Milwaukee: 1940. Pp. ix, 223.) The author in her Preface states as the purpose of this doctoral dissertation, "to introduce, to analyze, and to appraise Blunt's poetic and prose compositions, and to show their relation to the life and thought of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries." It is difficult to dissociate any writer from his times and from environmental, intellectual, and religious influences. Of necessity, these intangibles weave themselves in and out of any work. In a greater measure may this be said of the enigmatic William Scawen Blunt (1840-1922).

Educated as a Catholic from the age of eleven when his mother followed her spiritual adviser, Henry Edward Manning into the Church, Blunt in his early life became deeply imbued with the faith, in its beauty and greatness. His contacts were many and his interests wide—diplomat, figure in the fashionable world, poet, painter, and as he put it himself, "a pleader in the cause of the backward nations of the world". In 1869, Blunt married Lady Anne Isabelle King-Noel, the granddaughter of Lord Byron. The widespread influence of Darwin's *Origin of Species* left its mark on the religious convictions of the man and the reading of the works of Rousseau led him to resolve to write his memoirs. The reviewer agrees with the Reverend John Fenlon who in an article on Blunt remarked: "the effect of his resolution was a temptation to essay a role beyond his powers, and we fear, to act at times with an eye on his diary and future readers." His temporary leanings towards materialism, Mohammedanism, and even skepticism illustrate this point. Blunt belonged to the Romantic Movement in English literature from which Modernism sprang, he being one of the few Catholics who was definitely touched with Modernism.

Perhaps the strongest yet most succinct part of the study is the final chapter which deals with "Blunt and Contemporary Thought". In it are considered imperialism, socialism, materialism, Mohammedanism, the Bible, modernism, and Catholicism. The bibliography might have included with profit an editorial comment in the *Catholic World,* CXVI (Jan. 1923), 547 as well as a splendid article by Thomas F. Meehan which appeared in *America,* XXVI, (Feb. 18, 1922), 425, about the time of the death of Blunt. The index is adequate. (SISTER M. EVANGELINE THOMAS)

RYAN, THOMAS F., S.J. *China through Catholic Eyes.* (Hong Kong: Catholic Truth Society. 1941. Pp. 80. $1.50.) This album of some eighty pages opens with a short Preface in which the distinguished wife of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek pays a glowing tribute to the work accomplished by our Catholic missionaries in China, particularly, during the struggle already five years old to cast out and conquer the Japanese invaders.

The album divides into two sections. The first, which makes up roughly two-thirds of the booklet, deals with the history, the culture, and the religion of China, with special emphasis on the revolution of 1911 under Sun Yat-Sen from which the present Chinese Republic emerged. It gives a neat account of the rise and the activities of the recent communistic movement in China, and tells briefly of the career of China's present great leader, Chiang Kai-Shek.

The second section is concerned with the Catholic Church in China. Here we find first of all, a rather brief but satisfactory survey of the efforts of Catholic missionaries to bring China into the arms of Christ. Naturally, much attention is given to the labors of Matteo Ricci and other Jesuit missioners of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, who by their learning and zeal and Christ-like charity seemed well on the way to winning China over to the cause of Christ. Next, the author speaks of the developments of Christian endeavor during the nineteenth century down to the present day. The stress here seems to be on physical expansion in the way of schools, hospitals, and other institutions engaged in the various corporal works of mercy. The book closes on a note of confidence in the future of China as a nation and as a new cradle of Christian culture.

The album is abundantly illustrated, chiefly by Chinese artists. The narrative reads easily and holds one's interest throughout. While it is not intended to be a profound study, it does offer considerable information to a public which for the most part is still fairly unmindful of and perhaps even callous to the long-suffering peoples of this vast and grand, old civilization. It should serve to give us all a greater esteem and sympathy for China and the Chinese who, like ourselves, are fighting valiantly in order to be allowed to live as free men. (A. VIÉBAN)

SCHILPP, PAUL ARTHUR (Ed.) *The Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead.* (Evanston: Northwestern University. 1941. Pp. xviii, 745. $4.00.) This third volume of The Library of Living Philosophers, like its predecessors on Dewey and Santayana, is a symposium by eighteen of Professor Whitehead's colleagues in the field of philosophy, prefaced by an autobiographical essay and adding to the whole, two essays by the subject of the symposium, one on Mathematics and the Good and another on Immortality. The idea of this Library is to secure the advantage of a philosopher's reply to his appraisers before he passes from this earthly scene. The opportunity for clearing up misunderstandings should be very considerable. As a matter of fact this latest volume in the series, that is to include all the great living philosophers, is no more successful than the first two studies. None of the subjects of the seances has added very much by their replies to their critics in the way of clarification of thought. All the volumes are interesting insights into the extreme individualism of contemporary philosophers. Perhaps that is the

reason why such a thing as the viewpoint of the Neo-Scholastics could not be admitted in any of the series.

The wide range of Whitehead's philosophical interests is indicated in the eighteen essays. Whitehead the logician, the psychologist, the metaphysician, the physical realist, the aesthetician, the moralist, the biologist, and the theologian all come in for evaluation. It is not strange that all contributors should see his descriptions of reality as expressed in mathematical symbols, since Whitehead has been a philosopher for only the last twenty of his eighty years. Fundamentally his system is his own peculiar expression of the ancient philosophy of becoming as opposed to a truly metaphysical system of being such as is contained in the Aristotelian and Scholastic tradition. It has all the inherent weakness of a philosophy of flux, so alluring to scientists of evolution, plus a multitude of Whitehead's own neologisms which make him so hard to understand. Not even eighteen critics doing the best they can for their candidate for immortality can efface the inner contradictions upon which the system rests, or better, moves. (CHARLES A. HART)

STONE, EDWARD NOBLE (Tr.). *Three Old French Chronicles of the Crusades: The History of the Holy War; The History of them that took Constantinople; The Chronicle of Reims.* [University of Washington Publications in the Social Sciences, Volume 10] (Seattle: University of Washington Press. 1939. Pp. 377. $3.50.) The first of these chronicles is Ambroise's versified account of the Third Crusade, the second is Robert of Clari's Picard chronicle of the Fourth Crusade, and the third is the romantic anonymous chronicle of Reims, which runs from the period of Louis VII to that of Louis IX. The translator set out "by the rather literal translation of many quaint words and phrases, by a rather free use of archaisms in order to preserve the 'illusion of antiquity,' to present to the modern English reader a version that will give him, in some degree, the same set of impressions that an educated Frenchman of the present day receives from the perusal of the original." The forewords are insignificant and the notes few.

The volume, which represents much labor and expense, is for the most part a duplication of effort. A translation of Robert of Clari's text was published by McNeal in the Records of Civilization series before the present volume appeared and Ambroise's chronicle has since been published in a versified translation by Hubbard in the same series. To the latter LaMonte added the critical apparatus. These critically prepared works supersede Stone's contribution. Though he had completed his translation before the others appeared, he should have been in closer touch with the large group of scholars working on the history of the Crusades. The principal usefulness of the present volume will be found in its third part. To it is attached an appendix giving a summary of De Wailly's corrections of the historical aberrations of the chronicler. (ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER)

WARREN, CHARLES. *Odd Byways in American History.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press: 1942. Pp. 269. $3.00.) Those familiar with the work of Charles Warren relative to the Supreme Court and to the formation of the Constitution will be somewhat surprised at the tone and contents of this volume. The twelve essays in the collection cover a wide range of material

in the period from about 1775 to 1840. Although the essays have rather popular titles, such as "How Billiard Tables and Gold Spoons Became Campaign Issues", and "How the Great Tub Plot Scared the Federalists", the research antecedent to the publication of the papers was wide, thorough, and productive. The Notes to the various chapters present to the interested reader an opportunity to carry further the reading associated with many of the topics covered. Source material of many types is used, with particular stress placed upon the newspapers contemporaneous with the events mentioned. To those who think of history as being lifeless and dry, this book will be of particular interest, since it deals with the human likes and dislikes which are so powerful in determining the current of history.

Interesting, too, are some of the statements presented, showing as they do the unreliability of politicians and editors as appraisers of nations and individuals. John Adams, writing of England, during the Revolutionary War, remarked: "[It] will convince our Americans, I hope, that Great Britain has become literally, in the language of the old authors concerning Attila, the scourge of God and the plague of mankind. She must be abandoned and renounced forever." And William Cobbett, the Federalist editor, stated in 1798, when ill will against France was strong: "Whoever in the future recalls these letters [the X. Y. Z. letters] must hate, detest, abhor, and execrate the base, violent, and perfidious nation whose projects they develop. So shall the name of Frenchmen become a bye-word, a reproach, and a curse." If a reading of this book will prevent today's reader from making similar sweeping statements, and possibly equally sweeping mistakes, the book deserves attention. (PAUL KINIERY)

WILSON, CHARLES. *Anglo-Dutch Commerce and Finance in the Eighteenth Century*. (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co. 1942. Pp. xv, 235. $3.50.) When the Dutch Stadholder, William III, ascended the throne of England, Amsterdam was the commercial and financial capital of the world. A century later the economic center of gravity had definitely shifted across the channel to London. All students of English or Dutch history are familiar with the major factors involved in this epochal transposition. What they will welcome in Mr. Wilson's study is a sufficiently detailed and expertly presented account of the successive stages of the change as well as the men who were chiefly instrumental in effecting them. Drawing upon little-known and largely untapped sources, particularly the records of the Notaries in the Gemeente Archief at Amsterdam, he has contrived to avoid offering merely a jejune catalogue of business transactions by confining his narrative principally to a comparatively small group of Anglo-Dutch firms whose members were intimately bound together by ties of blood, marriage, or religion.

In the first section of the book the author shows how Holland, having taken advantage of her centralized position to achieve commercial supremacy during the seventeenth century, still maintained a monopoly in practically every branch of world trade at the opening of the eighteenth century despite such handicaps as the English Navigation Acts. Working generally on a commission basis, Amsterdam magnates amassed enormous profits especially from

the export of German linens to England and the distribution of English cloth and colonial goods to the rest of Europe. Several factors contributed to bring about a sharp decline in Dutch trade. Countries which had long used Holland as entrepôt gradually established direct commercial relations and their governments, notably the British, imposed tariffs and supplied bounties to stimulate home industry and commerce. The prime mistake of the Dutch, Mr. Wilson contends, was their failure to capitalize and foster their own industrial development. Instead, fortunes derived from trade were invested in foreign securities. Copious correspondence of the merchants preserved in the Archief Brants reveals that they had a marked preference for English stocks. The transition to finance was not in itself necessarily fatal to the economic life of Holland; in fact, during the mid-century period Amsterdam enjoyed an era of financial ascendency over London which was due in no small part to her banking and credit services in paying Britain's continental armies and allies. What was serious was the fact that, owing to the absence of any effective check on speculation, Amsterdam failed to create an impression of real security. Following a series of crises which began in 1763, Dutch financiers migrated in increasing numbers to London. The outbreak of hostilities in 1780 virtually terminated economic relationships between the two countries and, as may be seen in retrospect, marked the eclipse of Dutch financial supremacy.

The author supplies illuminating appendices indicating the collocation of Dutch money in English stocks, but it is regrettable that he omits such interesting points of information as the sum of their loans to the British government and the total amount of English stocks held by Dutch investors at any one time. (CLARENCE J. RYAN)

WOOD, RALPH (Ed.) *The Pennsylvania Germans.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1942. Pp. viii, 299. $3.00.) The purpose of these essays is to answer the question: "Who are the Pennsylvania Germans, why are they what they are, and what is their place in America?" Only incidental, therefore, is the treatment of phases which have elsewhere been abundantly described. It is a work to which eight writers, all of Pennsylvania-German stock and tradition, have contributed.

Arthur D. Graeff introduces the work with a chapter on "Pennsylvania, the Colonial Melting Pot", which sketches in a popular manner the ethnic pattern of that state. Walter M. Kollmorgen, in his chapter on the "Pennsylvania German Farmer", writes informingly of agricultural practices, the displacement of the non-German from the better limestone lands, his method of living, his beliefs and superstitions, his attitude toward education and religion, and his economic philosophy. The Reverend G. Paul Musselman presents a rambling chapter on the sects which has considerably more to say of the Mennonites than of the Quakers, Amish, Schwenkfelders, Moravians, and Dunkards. Professor Wood has a more substantial study of "Lutherans and Reformed, Pennsylvania German Style". His thesis is that the church was to the Germans as the New England town meeting was to the Yankee; that the German language and the church are synonymous; and that the struggle to maintain the language brought close the Lutheran and Reformed

churches. Professor Clyde S. Stine is well qualified to write on the "Pennsylvania Germans and the School". Opposition to the public school system arose from the belief that real education was given on the farm; sufficient knowledge of the three "R's" for the purposes of rural economy and the understanding of the Scriptures was all that was considered necessary. When the heavy German immigration persisted in the use of that language, these people were accused of being "popish" emissaries and "tools of the French"; it was then thought that education would conform the Germans to the English pattern. Of one teacher it was related: "Er war en Eirischer; Himmel! wie hott er die Dietsche verkloppt!" ("He was an Irishman; Heavens! how he walloped the Dutch!") State educational legislation resulted in strong opposition, and the German Ku Klux Klan, fearful of Catholic participation, fought to retain the constitutional provision that money raised for public schools should not be appropriated for the support of any sectarian school. Ralph Wood contributes a second chapter, "Journalism among the Pennsylvania Germans". The German press was Democratic in politics, isolationist and pacific, and reflected the opinion of the readers in matters of education and the language of court procedure. A good account is given of the more prominent papers, almanacs, magazines, and of their editors. Pennsylvania German literature is discussed by Professor Harry Reichard. Two reasons are advanced for the use of the dialect in early literature: resentment against "the feeling of superiority that the 'New Germans' expressed" and resentment against the English "who thought that the 'dumb Dutch' learned English too slowly." Mr. Graeff also writes a second chapter, "Pennsylvania Germans as Soldiers", which repeats too much of what the author said in his first chapter.

The most satisfactory chapter in the book is the contribution of Professor Richard H. Shryock on the "Pennsylvania Germans as Seen by the Historian", which inquires into the origin and development of the historian's neglect, and the misunderstanding and distortion of these people. Misunderstanding, it is held, arose when German settlers actually were foreigners to the English of the colony. The survival of the foreign language was to many proof of inferiority—an attitude that seemed justified when the sects opposed innovations and continued their superstitions and customs. Misunderstanding also arose from the tendency to regard those who had lost the dialect as no longer Germans: hence the "Dutch" got no credit for the professional and more highly educated classes. In connection with the account given of the efforts made to correct the historian's neglect, the American Historical Association is erroneously given credit for sponsoring Marion Learned's *Guide to the Manuscript Materials relating to American History in the German State Archives;* this was prepared under the auspices of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. As an appendix, A. F. Buffington contributes a grammatical and linguistic study of the Pennsylvania German dialect.

The book, in the main, is a popular product. There are few footnotes, but a bibliographical guide indicates some of the more important publications in the field. An unfortunate omission is any reference to the Pennsylvania German Catholics who had religious customs and a social background distinctly their own. (Leo F. Stock)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

Recent Development in Economic History. Herbert Heaton (*Amer. Histor. Rev.*, July).

Doctors of Philosophy in History. William B. Hesseltine and Louis Kaplan (*ibid.*).

How Archaeology Aids History. M. Rostovtzeff (*Yale Review*, Summer).

The Principle of Nationalities. Stephen J. Brown, S.J. (*Catholic World*, July).

The Theory of Democracy. Part IV. Mortimer J. Adler and Walter Farrell, O.P. (*Thomist*, July).

Etats totalitaires ou états chrétiens. Georges Simard, O.M.I. (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, July-Sept.).

The Pope and Peace. P. J. Gannon, S.J. (*Studies*, June).

Henri Bergson, 1859-1940. Arthur H. Ryan (*ibid.*).

Aristotle and Alexander the Great. Michael Tierney (*ibid.*).

Tocqueville's Conception of the Elite. Francis G. Wilson (*Review of Politics*, July).

On the Russian Revolution: Was Stagnation Its Cause? N. S. Timasheff (*ibid.*).

Corporativism in Europe. Part III. Paul Vignaux (*ibid.*).

Catholic Philosophy and American Culture. Robert Pollock (*Thought*, Sept.).

A Scholastic Philosopher and the New Criticism. William J. Grace (*ibid.*).

A Conservative's Reflections on the Future of Europe. Francis S. Campbell (*ibid.*).

The Later Paganism. Harold Mattingly (*Harvard Theological Review*, July).

Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Exorcism of the Cilicium. Johannes Quasten (*ibid.*).

The Saintly Scholars of the Church. Stephen McKenna, C.SS.R (*Ecclesiastical Rev.*, Aug.).

The 'Portraits' of Emperors in Southern Italian *Exultet* Rolls and the Liturgical Commemoration of the Emperor. Gerard Burian Ladner (*Speculum*, Apr.).

A Note on an Inscription of the Cathedral of Santiago de Compostela. Meyer Schapiro (*ibid.*).

Speculative Thinking in Mediaeval Music. Manfred F. Bukofzer (*ibid.*).

The Conventional Saracen of the Songs of Geste. C. Meredith Jones (*ibid.*).

Petrarch's Conception of the "Dark Ages". Theodor E. Mommsen (*ibid.*).

Ms. Bodl. 292 and the Canon of Nicholas Trevet's Works. Ruth J. Dean (*ibid.*).

A Persian Myth in the *Alethia of Claudius Marius Victor*. A. H. Krappe (*ibid.*).

Hebrew Printing in Naples. Joshua Bloch (*Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, June).

Der kichenrechtliche Anstoss zu Johann Adam Möhlers theologischer Entwicklung. Johannes Baptist Sägmüller (*Theologische Quartalschrift*, 122 [1941], 1).

Mittelalterliche Passionsmystik und Frömmigkeit: Der älteste Herz-Jesu-Hymnus. Georg Schreiber (*ibid.*).

The Persecution of the Christians in Japan in the Middle of the Seventeenth Century. Edward Hagemann (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, June).

EUROPEAN

The Influence of the Clergy and the 'Instituteurs Primaires' in the Election of the French Constituent Assembly, April, 1848. A. Cobban (*English Histor. Rev.*, July).

Realities and Illusions about Italy. Carlo Sforza (*Free World*, July).

Printing and the Growth of a Protestant Movement in Germany from 1517 to 1524. Louise W. Holborn (*Church Hist.*, June).

The Short-Lived American College at Muenster in Westphalia, 1866-1885? [concluded]. John M. Lenhart, O.F.M.Cap. (*Social Justice Rev.*, July-Aug.).

National Socialism before 1933. Norman H. Baynes (*History*, Mar.).

Romania and the Balkan Crisis of 1875-78. Richard V. Burks (*Journal of Central European Affairs*, July).

German Geopolitics. Joseph S. Roucek (*ibid.*).

A Struggle for Austria in Berlin and Frankfort 1849-1855. Part II. Frederic Engel-Janosi (*ibid.*).

The Negotiations for a National Ausgleich in Austria in 1871. Eric Fischer (*ibid.*).

The Social Background of the Pre-War Polish Political Structure. Alexander Hertz (*ibid.*).

The Germans in Bohemia from Maria Theresa to 1918. S. Harrison Thomson (*ibid.*).

Renaissance in Northern Europe: The Catholic Roots of Scandinavian Culture. W. Gore Allen (*Tablet*, Aug. 8).

BRITISH EMPIRE

Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Mons Agned* and *Castellum Puellarum*. Roland Blenner-Hassett (*Speculum*, Apr.).

Wales and the Mediaeval Slave Trade. Erik I. Bromberg (*ibid.*).

A Forgotten Augustinian Abbey: St. Mary of the Meadows, Leicester. A. F. Allison (*Month*, May-June).

Rome and the Counter-Revolution in England. L. Hicks (*Month*, July-Aug.).

Historic Silver from Holyrood. Noel Macdonald Wilby (*ibid.*).

A New Life of Richard II (review of *Richard II* by Anthony Steel). V. H. Galbraith (*History*, Mar.).

The Medieval Plough-Team. H. G. Richardson (*ibid.*).

The Exchequer of Chester. R. Stewart-Brown (*English Histor. Rev.*, July).

Henry of Canterbury. G. P. Cuttino (*ibid.*).

The Clerk of the Crown. A. F. Pollard (*ibid.*).

An Early Version of the Anglo-Saxon Coronation Ceremony. Paul L. Ward (*ibid.*).

A History of the Presbyterian Party from Pride's Purge to the Dissolution of the Long Parliament. Leland H. Carlson (*Church Hist.*, June).

The Evolution of the Humanitarian Spirit in Eighteenth Century England. Frank J. Klingberg (*Pennsylvania Mag. of Hist.*, July).

England Through German Eyes. Parts I and II. Stanley Godman (*Tablet*, June 13 and 20).

A Centenary and a Golden Jubilee [Mother Morrogh Bernard and the Providence Woollen Mills]. John Ryan, S.J. (*Studies*, June).

Biographical Dictionary of Irishmen in France. Part II. Richard Hayes (*ibid.*).

AMERICAN

Have the Americas a Common History? A United States View. William C. Binkley (*Canadian Histor. Rev.*, June).

A Canadian View. George W. Brown (*ibid.*).

A Mexican View. Edmundo O'Gorman (*ibid.*).

A South American View. Germon Arciniegas (*ibid.*).

A Note on the Catholic Derivation of the American Declaration of Independence. Christopher Hollis (*Tablet*, July 4).

Labor, Education, and Politics in the 1830's. Sidney L. Jackson (*Pennsylvania Mag. of Hist.*, July).

Some Protestant Attitudes on the Labor Questions in 1886. Carl Warren Griffiths (*Church Hist.*, June).

Heinrich Zschokke's Version of the Founding of Maryland. Erich Albrecht (*American-German Rev.*, Aug.).

Castle St. Mark and the Patriots of the Revolution. Albert Mauncy and Alberta Johnson (*Florida Histor. Quart.*, July).

Daniel Carroll, Framer of the Constitution. Richard J. Purcell (*Records of the American Catholic Histor. Soc.*, June, 1941).

Foundations of Catholic Sisterhoods in United States. Sister Maria Alma (*ibid.*).

A discourse on General Washington. Bishop John Carroll (*ibid.*).

Father John Thayer, 1758-1815. Richard J. Purcell (*Studies*, June).

Montreal Tercentenary. Anon. (*Voice*, June).

La traverse entre Québec et Lévis. P.-G. Roy (*Le Bulletin des Recherches Historiques*, Aug.).

L'histoire française de Villemarie. Gustave Lanctôt (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, July-Sept.).

Le problème de l'éducation et le journalisme canadien-français de 1800. Séraphim Marion (*ibid.*).

Le retour des Jésuites au Canada (1842). Léon Pouliot, S.J. (*Le Bulletin des Recherches Historiques*, July).

Vues sur l'éducation national. Arthur Maheux (*Le Canada Français*, June).

Précieux témoignage d'un anglais [Wilfrid Bovey] (fin). C. E. Marquis (*ibid.*).

History of Martinsburg, West Virginia, Church. John T. Reilly (*Catholic Virginian*, July and Sept.).

The Southern Career of Don Juan Mariano Picornell. Harris Gaylord Warren (*Journal of Southern Hist.*, Aug.).

Religion in the South. Haskell M. Miller (*Christendom*, Summer).

Mr. Bruté Becomes a Bishop. Theodore Maynard (*Commonweal*, June 26).

Did Abraham Lincoln Receive the Illinois German Vote? Jay Monaghan (*Journal of the Illinois State Histor. Soc.*, June).

The German Element in Early Pennsylvania Politics, 1789-1800; A Study in Americanization. Andreas Dorpalen (*Pennsylvania Hist.*, July).

The German Element and the Issues of the Civil War. Andreas Dorpalen (*Mississippi Valley Histor. Rev.*, June).

Vilaite and the Catholic Church [concluded]. Joseph Marx and Benjamin J. Blied (*Salesianum*, July).

St. Nazianz, A German Settlement. John Eiselmeier (*American-German Review*, June).

Public Opinion in Wisconsin during World War I. Karen Falk (*Wisconsin Mag. of Hist.*, June).

Frederick Jackson Turner, Historian. Avery Craven (*ibid.*).

The Beloved Mendicant [Moments from the Life of Father Francis Koch, O.F.M. (1843-1920)]. Benjamin F. Musser (*Provincial Annals*, Province of the Holy Name, July).

Father Nicholas Wachter Comes to America. John B. Wuest, O.F.M (*Provincial Chronicle*, St. John Baptist Province, Spring).

Franciscan Missions among the Navajo Indians. Part VII. Emmanuel Trockur, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

Diego Martínez de Hurdaide: Defender of the Northwestern Frontier of New Spain. Harry Prescott Johnson (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*).

Francis Drake's California Anchorage in the Light of the Indian Language Spoken There. Robert E. Heizer and William W. Elmendorf (*ibid.*).

William Ingraham Kip—First Bishop of California. Edward L. Parsons (*Histor. Mag. of Protestant Episcopal Church*, June) .

The African Immigrant in Colonial Pennsylvania and Delaware. Frank J. Klingberg (*ibid.*).

The Reverend Samuel Myles and His Boston Ministry. Edgar Legare Pennington (*ibid.*).

History of the Church Divinity School of the Pacific. Henry H. Shires (*ibid.*).

A Brief Biography of Prince Paul Wilhelm of Württemberg (1797-1860). Louis B. Butscher (*New Mexico Histor. Rev.*, July).

La controversia entre Las Casas y Sepúlveda en Valladolid, 1550-1551. Lewis Hanke (*Revista de la Universidad Católica Bolivariana*, Feb.-Mar.).

Fray Juan de Zumarraga y la imprenta en America. Demetrio S. García (*La Voz Guadalupana*, June).

Branded Books from Mexican Libraries. L. M. Stark (*Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, Aug.).

Cuestiones Históricas. Una página para la historia del Segundo Imperio. Jesús García Gutiérrez (*Abside*, Apr.-June, 1942).

Recuerdos de mi vida (cont.). Archbishop Leopoldo Ruiz y Flores (*Christus*, June and July).

Beata Mariana de Jesús Paredes. Jesús García Gutiérrez (*ibid.*, June).

San Francisco Solano, O.F.M. Jesús García Gutiérrez (*ibid.*, July).

Immigration in Cuba. Duvon C. Corbitt (*Hispanic American Histor. Rev.*, May).

La marina de guerra norteamericana y las guerras de independencia hispanoamericanas (1815-1823). Arthur Preston Whittaker (*Revista de la Universidad Católica del Perú*, Apr.).

Nóbrega of Brazil. Jerome V. Jacobson (*Mid-America*, July).

Luiz da Grã, Mission Builder and Educator of Brazil. J. Manuel Espinosa (*ibid.*).

Cuarto Aniversario de la Fundación de la Sociedad Chihuahuense de Estudios Historicos. (*Boletín Sociedad Chihuahuense de Estudios Históricos*, June).

Protestants in South America. John Erskine (*America*, July 4, *Catholic Digest*, July).

Catholicism in Latin America: Its Passing Weakness and Abiding Strength. Frans van Cauwelaert (*Tablet*, Aug. 29).

ST. MARY'S OF THE
NOT TO BE
TAKEN FROM THE
READING ROOM
COLL

BOOKS RECEIVED

Bailey, Thomas A., *A Diplomatic History of the American People.* 2nd ed. (New York: F. S. Crofts Co. 1942. Pp. xxvi, 864. $4.25.)

Bannon, John Francis, S.J., *Epitome of Western Civilization.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1942. Pp. xi, 291. $2.25.) This volume by Father Bannon of St. Louis University is intended to provide a guide to the teacher and student harrassed by the problems inherent in the survey course in western civilization. In sixty-six topics the author briefly sketches some of the salient features of the outstanding movements of history from the days of antiquity to the present war. References are given to the pertinent sections of larger survey texts and to source books, and subjects are suggested at the end of each topic for review. The volume has an index and is provided with two maps of Europe on the inside covers.

Beiser, J. Ryan, *The Vatican Council and the American Secular Newspapers, 1869-70.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1941. Pp. ix, 327. $2.50.)

Brodie, Bernard, *A Layman's Guide to Naval Strategy.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1942. Pp. x, 291. $2.50.)

Brunhouse, Robert L., *The Counter-Revolution in Pennsylvania, 1776-1790.* (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical Commission. 1942. Pp. viii, 368.)

Chrimes, S. B. (Trans. and Ed.), *Sir John Fortescue de Laudibus Legum Anglie.* (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co. 1942. Pp. cxiv, 235. $6.00.)

Clarkson, Paul S., and Clyde T. Warren, *The Law of Property in Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Drama.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1942. xxvii, 346. $3.50.)

Crosby, Sumner McKnight, *The Abbey of St. Denis, 475-1122.* Vol. I. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1942. Pp. xiv, 211. $7.00.)

Dietz, Frederick C., *An Economic History of England.* (New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1942. $3.00.) This volume is intended to give to American students a picture of how Englishmen have made their living over the centuries, how changes in the ways of doing things came about, and how political and social life influenced and have been influenced by economic problems as time went on. Professor Dietz is recognized as our greatest authority on Tudor finance. He makes this difficult study understandable for the non-technical reader. There is a valuable appendix on the value of English money and a definition of unfamiliar terms. Current economic war problems make the book up-to-date.

Eguiguren, Luis Antonio, *Guerra Separatista del Peru (1777-1780).* (Lima, Peru: Imprenta Torres Aguirre. 1942. Pp. 83.)

Emerson, Rupert, *The Netherlands Indies and the United States.* (Boston: World Peace Foundation. 1942. Pp. 92. Paper, 25c; cloth, 50c.) This brochure of Dr. Emerson of Harvard University is No. 6 in the America Looks Ahead Series edited by S. Shepard Jones. It consists of two parts, one on the historical background of the Dutch Indies, and a second on the relations and interests of the United States in those territories. It contains as well an appendix of the Netherlands Government Declaration to the People's Council at Batavia of November 13, 1941, and a list of twelve works in English on the Indies.

Emygdio da Silva, Fernando, *L'essor Colonial Portugais*. (Lisbonne: Casa Portuguesa, Rua da Misericordia, 139. 1941. Pp. 61.)

Eustolia, Sister M., *With Wings as Doves*. (Oakland: College of the Holy Names. 1942. Pp. xiv, 177.)

Ewald, Sister Marie Liguori, *Ovid in the Contra Orationem Symmachi of Prudentius*. (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1942. Pp. xiv, 220. $2.00.) This is Volume 66 of the Patristic Studies of the University's Department of Greek and Latin. The study was done under the direction of Professor Roy J. Deferrari.

Gipson, Lawrence Henry, *Zones of International Friction. The Great Lakes Frontier, Canada, the West Indies, India 1748-1754*. Vol. 5. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1942. Pp. xlviii, 352, lix. $5.00.)

Guide to the Manuscripts in the Archives of the Moravian Church in America. Southern Province. (Raleigh: North Carolina Historical Records Survey. 1942. Pp. vii, 136.) This volume was sponsored by the North Carolina Historical Commission of which R. D. W. Connor is chairman.

Hackett, Charles Wilson, *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and Ottermin's Attempted Reconquest, 1680-1682*. Parts I and II. Vols. VIII and IX of the Coronado Historical Series edited by George P. Hammond. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. 1942. Pp. ccx, 262; xii, 430. 2 Vols., $10.00.)

Haffert, John Mathias, *Mary in Her Scapular Promise*. (Sea Isle City, N. J.: Scapular Press. 1942. Pp. viii. 214. Brochure edition, 50c.) This is the second edition of the brochure on the Carmelite scapular of Our Lady by Father Haffert. Monsignor Sheen has written the Preface.

Hoare, Sister M. Regis, *Virgin Soil. Mother Seton from a Different Point of View*. (Boston: Christopher Publishing House. 1942. Pp. xii, 176. $2.00.)

Houck, Frederick A., *Our Palace Wonderful*. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1942. Pp. 180. $1.25.) This is a revised and enlarged edition of the little volume by Father Houck first published in 1935.

Jacobson, David, *The Social Background of the Old Testament*. (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press. 1942. Pp. xi, 327. $2.00.)

James, Father, O.F.M.Cap., *The Person of Jesus*. (Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd. 1942. Pp. iv, 126. 3/5.) In seven brief chapters Father James, professor of philosophy at University College, Cork, discusses the personality of Christ.

Jarrett, Bede, O.P., *Social Theories of the Middle Ages, 1200-1500*. (Westminster, Md.: Newman Book Shop. 1942. Pp. ix, 280. $4.00.) The Newman Book Shop has done a real service in reprinting this book. Originally published in 1926, the work has been out of print and could rarely be obtained at second-hand. History is the poorer for the fact that Father Jarrett was not free to devote his efforts primarily to research rather than to administrative duties. It is unfortunate that he is not alive to revise and enlarge this volume. Perhaps the reprinting will spur another scholar to accomplish that work.

Lally, F. E., *As Lord Acton Says*. (Newport, R. I.: Remington Ward. 1942. Pp. viii, 300. $3.00.)

Mackinder, Halford J., *Democratic Ideals and Reality*. (New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1942. Pp. xxvi, 219. $1.90.)

McWilliams, J. A., S.J., *Philosophy for the Millions*. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1942. Pp. vii, 206. $2.00.)

Manning, William R., (Ed), *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States. Canadian Relations, 1784-1860*. Vol. I. (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1942. Pp. xlvii, 947. $5.00.)

Marguerite, Sister M., *This Is Our Town.* (Boston: Ginn & Co. 1942. Pp. 320. 96c.)

Mattern, Johannes, *Geopolitik, Doctrine of National Self-Sufficiency and Empire.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1942. Pp. 139, xiv. $2.00.)

Maynard, Theodore, *The Reed and the Rock, Portrait of Simon Bruté.* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1942. Pp. xi, 273. $2.75.)

Molendyk, Clara A. and Benjamin C. Edwards, *Thus Be It Ever. A Heritage of Freedom.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1942. Pp. xv, 508. $1.60.)

Muench, Aloisius J., *Synodus Diocesana Fargensis Prima.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1941. Pp. ix, 303.) This very attractive volume contains the decrees of the first synod of the diocese of Fargo. It includes also appendices of the diocesan faculties, a diocesan calendar, prayers and devotions and a glossary of terms. It has an excellent index. The make-up of the book is a model.

Munro, Dana Gardner, *The Latin American Republics, A History.* (New York: D. Appleton-Century. 1942. Pp. ix, 650. $4.00.) This new text in Latin American history is the work of the William Stewart Tod Professor of Public Affairs at Princeton University. It is equipped with a chronological chart, eleven good maps, and a Reading List of fourteen pages which makes mention of printed sources and secondary works in English. The Church is, of course, dealt with in some detail as is necessary in any history of these countries. The tone of Professor Munro's treatment is an improvement over that of some previous works, but the Catholic reader might wish a lengthier statement of the positive contributions made by the Church in these lands. The bibliography on Ecuador makes no mention of the recent study of Richard Pattee on *Gabriel García Moreno* (Quito, 1941.)

Nichols, Madaline Wallis, *The Gaucho, Cattle Hunter, Cavalryman, Ideal of Romance.* (Durham: Duke University Press. 1942. Pp. ix, 152. $3.00.)

Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Volume LXVI. October, 1936-May, 1941. (Boston: Published by the Society. 1942. Pp. xiv, 613.) The new volume in this important series contains accounts of the meetings of the Society held between October, 1936, and May, 1941. The greater part of the volume, however, is given over to twenty-four papers on various phases of New England history. Professor Samuel A. Eliot is the heaviest contributor with four articles. Students of historiography will be interested in his tribute to Albert Bushnell Hart, in Henry S. Commager's essay on John Fiske, and in Stewart Mitchell's "Henry Adams and Some of His Students." The Society celebrated its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary in April, 1941, at a dinner at the Algonquin Club, mention of which is included in the present volume.

Riesenfeld, Stefan A., *Protection of Coastal Fisheries under International Law.* (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1942. Pp. xii, 296. $2.00.) This well-documented monograph is by an assistant professor of law in the University of Minnesota. It is No. 5 of the Monograph Series of the Carnegie Endowment's Division of International Law.

Romig, Walter (Ed.), *The Book of Catholic Authors.* (Detroit: Walter Romig & Co. 1942. Pp. viii, 302. $2.20.)

Russell, Robert P., O.S.A., *Divine Providence and the Problem of Evil. A Translation of St. Augustine's De Ordine.* (New York: Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service Co., Inc. 1942. Pp. iv, 191. $2.00.) Father Russell is a member of the faculty of Villanova College.

Savelle, Max, *The Foundations of American Civilization.* (New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1942. Pp. xvi, 773. $3.90.) Mr. Savelle of Stanford University states as his reasons for writing another text in colonial history